

Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting
Thursday 10 December 2020 by Zoom
MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andy Chaggar	AC	Mike Tyrell (Southwark Council)	MT
Andy Rodrigues	AR	Neil Kirby (Southwark Council)	NK
Amelia Leeson	AL	Sophie Hall-Thompson (Southwark)	SHT
Comfort Kumi	CK	Neal Purvis (Open Communities)	NP
Francis Phillip	FP	Stephen Moore (Open Communities)	SM
Juliette Wodzicki	JW	Patrick McDermott	PM
Maria Palumbo	MP	Paulette Kelly	PK

1. Introductions and apologies

- 1.1. NP took the Chair and invited all participants to introduce themselves.
- 1.2. Apologies were received from Jess Horwill, and Andrew Eke.

2. Minutes of TEPG meeting 12.11.20

- 1.1. The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

2. LBS Update on IDM and process to Cabinet Meeting in January

- 2.1. NK said the IDM setting out the option for the ballot had been agreed and the decision can be implemented. That is, to go with Option 5 and that is the basis upon which we have been talking over the last month. The next stage is to go to Cabinet Meeting of Councillors, at 11am on January 19. The report is being drafted and goes through a number of stages before going to Cabinet. That report will give approval to go ahead with the ballot, which is a key stage in the process.
- 2.2. The stage after that is for a report to Councillors on the ballot result. That will be presented to the Cabinet on March 9, which is a day after the result comes in. There will also be another report to the Council's Cabinet in July setting out what happens next. The key document for the next stage is the Draft Offer Document.
- 2.3. NP asked when the RPG will get to see the draft version of the Cabinet report? NK confirmed the report is public the Friday before Cabinet, which is January 8. NK said we will make sure people have seen the link.
- 2.4. JW asked if this (Option 5) was now official? NP said that Option 5 is the option that will be put to residents to vote on in the ballot in February.

3. Resident Engagement Plan

- 3.1. MT said there were few changes to the Resident Engagement Plan. The Offer Document is going to be issued in January following approval from Cabinet. The Offer Document will be Appendix 1 of that report.
- 3.2. The Ballot will be delivered by Civica. There will not be a ballot box on the estate. Postal ballots have to be received by the date of the close of ballot. So we will have to make sure that people have voted and people are aware that they must have it in on the closing date. It is important that people vote early.
- 3.3. SHT said they are looking to start the ballot on February 10 and conclude on Friday March 5, which is 3 weeks and 2 days and complies with the GLA rules. The Offer Document will come out on the day after the Cabinet report, which will be January 20.
- 3.4. FP asked for clarification of when and how the decision had been taken to have a vote on Option 5. NP said this was discussed at the last meeting, and this was a decision made by Cllr Pollak.
- 3.5. NK said the question will be “Do you support Option 5, yes or no?” If the decision in the Ballot is ‘No’, then Option 1 is pursued. In line with GLA rules.
- 3.6. PK asked how Civica will get people engaged? How is it going to be conducted? SHT said they have to take into account the Covid-19 pandemic. There will be a telephone option to vote where you call a specific number and will have a personal PIN number to vote Yes or No. There will be an online option where you click Yes or No, and there is a postal option, but all the votes must be received by the close of Ballot date.
- 3.7. Civica will check in on people who they have not received a vote from. LBS will be aiming to ensure that participation is as high as possibly can be.
- 3.8. NP said he knows that some residents will need some additional help and support in order to vote. Open Communities will support residents who need help to understand the Offer Document and to register their vote.

4. Draft Offer Document

- 4.1. SHT that the Offer Document is being updated to take account of comments that have been made in the last couple of weeks. Images are being worked on by Common Grounds.
- 4.2. NP asked when the document would be finished and when residents have to get comments to the council by? SHT said she needed to receive comments and questions by the end of next week (18 December).
- 4.3. NP introduced the Draft Offer Document page by page, and asked for questions and comments as he went.
- 4.4. Page 23 – Manor Grove: AC asked whether the commitments to tenants on the Housing Waiting List also covered tenants in the towers and private tenants in Manor Grove living in overcrowded accommodation and in housing need? MT said

it is a commitment to council tenants – the only commitment to private tenants, are to those on the Housing Waiting List.

- 4.5. NP said it needs to be clearer who that commitment is for. MT said it is for council tenants who are in housing need and are not living in homes due to be demolished.
- 4.6. PK asked what the status is of people who have not been on the Housing Waiting List for at least 12 months? MT confirmed they would not have the priority under the Local Lettings Scheme; the reason for the 12-month minimum is to protect the tenants who are already on the list and living on the estate.
- 4.7. PK said some people may fall between two stools. NP added that there may be some people who are not in housing need now but will be in housing need in three years' time when things are happening all around them. **MT agreed to clarify exactly what that means for them in a letter to everyone on the Housing Waiting List, so they are aware.** This will go out alongside the Offer Document.
- 4.8. NP said that at the leaseholder meeting last night, a major issue of concern was the way homes were to be valued. Part of it was how the impact of the stock condition survey would be reflected in the price offered for their home. **SHT to provide feedback to NP for the leaseholders who are concerned.**
- 4.9. NP said residents in Hillbeck were asking what kind of options they would have because there will be no new homes available when they have to move out and they were concerned that the homes available to move into would not be in suitable condition. What kind of level of supply is there likely to be? MT said every property that becomes available on the Tustin Estate is being used for temporary accommodation, so that we have homes available on the Estate we can use temporarily for estate residents leaving a home due to be demolished, in the first phase, such as Hillbeck.
- 4.10. NP said one leaseholder wants to move directly into the over-55s accommodation, but are concerned that it won't be built until Phase 2. NK said they would talk through options with them about temporary rehousing. It could be going into a council property for a period, or a private property; we would have that discussion with them.
- 4.11. NP asked if the council would, at the point they move out, fix the value of the home they are leaving and fix the value of the home they will move into? NK said there will be indicative figures for the sale value and the acquisition value, and they will be part of that discussion.
- 4.12. AL asked might someone sell their flat 2 or 3 years before buying their new one? What if the Bakerloo Line opens in the meantime [and affects values]? **NK said he would come back with a definitive view from the Council by 18.12.20.**
- 4.13. AL said she had heard that leaseholders could pay council rents if they moved out? NK said when they move temporarily into a council property they will pay rent on it. **MT to discuss this with NK outside of the meeting.**
- 4.14. Re: District Heating – AL asked if it was feasible for leaseholders to choose whether or not they are connected to the district heating if they buy a new property on the estate? SHT said the reliability of the new district heating system is very good, and

she would be interested to know why people might not want to be connected. NP said the issue raised last night was over reliability.

- 4.15. AL asked for clarity on the difference between shared equity and an equity loan.
- 4.16. NP said it would be useful to know over what period of time freeholders will be asked to pay the £844 costs noted for wider estate works.
- 4.17.** AC asked if there was an option for leaseholders to buy into elements of the refurbishment works taking place on council tenants' properties, such as window replacement? NK agreed in principle, where properties are being refurbished then leaseholders and freeholders could buy into that. **NK agreed to add a line into the Offer Document.**
- 4.18. AC said he couldn't see any difference in the illustrations to the communal areas in Manor Grove? SHT said the Stock Condition Survey did look at the repair and maintenance aspect on Manor Grove, but if LBS are looking at more than that, then there will be a cost implication. Images to be more specific about the garages and common areas.
- 4.19. AR asked for detail about external work to Manor Grove like pavements and pitched roofs? SHT will include mention in the Offer Document about when that will be done, and that will have a cost implication for leaseholders and freeholders. Discussion about other work will be picked up later in the meeting. Pavement work can be included in information on pathways/routes through the estate.
- 4.20. The document also needs more detail of work opportunities and training and apprenticeship opportunities for residents.
- 4.21. Re: Floorplans – it is worth adding in the document that there will be a huge variety of different layouts.
- 4.22. AL said she had only seen a couple of floorplan layouts that have dual aspects – to have, for example, a north-east and north-west aspect would not really be suitable. AL asked for assurance that 90-95 per cent of the homes will have a dual aspect and that sunlight will flood into those homes at some point during the day.
- 4.23. SHT said the design team were only asked how many homes there could be within the space standards; now what we need to do is start looking internally at the proposition. A lot of the examples do exceed the space standards that are required, so hopefully that gives confidence that we can play around with the layouts. Our design team has gone further than the Southwark Council Residential Design Guidelines.
- 4.24.** NP said he would send the council's New Council Homes Design Standards to everyone on the RPG. He said these are design standards that are above the local regional and national standards. AL was asking what constitutes 'dual aspect', looking for a commitment that there will be very homes that will be in that position. SHT said the council's commitments meet the London Plan and national standards, and it does say in there what is accepted as 'dual aspect'. **LBS and architects to look further into dual aspect homes once we have got the ballot result.**

- 4.25. AL asked for an assurance that 95 per cent of homes will be dual aspect and that those that are single aspect are only one-bedroom homes. SHT said the council's New Homes document sets the proportion at 70 per cent. NK added that the council will be looking to maximise the dual aspects, but we cannot say any more than that at the moment because of the stage we are at in the design process. He agreed this will be a key aspect of the next stage.
- 4.26. AL said it would be really good to collaborate with the architects going forward, including developing 3D modelling so it's more viable for residents to enter the conversation.
- 4.27. NP asked if the Brief for the next stage of the architects' work can include a commitment for this? **NK said he was happy to do this; taking people to see another property, or venues or and 3D and virtual models, and putting that in the brief for the next stage of procurement.**
- 4.28. AL asked why 6 of the 8 drawings the architects produced were single aspect properties? **SHT said she hadn't realised so few were dual aspect – she agreed to get back to AL on that.**
- 4.29. FP said that at the last meeting everyone was told that there would be only 1-5 bedroom homes on the estate, and no bedsits. NP confirmed that this is the proposal for new Council Homes.
- 4.30. SHT agreed to look at including relatable comparisons to illustrate bedroom sizes, etc, and to **include imperial measurements alongside metric.**
- 4.31. NP said page 40 needs more detail, and that some of the questions about Manor Grove's common areas would fit on page 43 'Your Estate'.
- 4.32. NP pointed out that a 3D image of the school had been produced and everyone has understood it, so perhaps the architects can be pushed to do this for the homes as well?
- 4.33. NP asked residents if there was anything else missing from the document? He said there was not much information about what the refurbishment of Manor Grove homes would mean; there needs to be something in there about pitched roofs. JW has also said that some of the leaseholders and freeholders may be interested in buying into that.
- 4.34. JW asked why the typology of homes in Manor Grove was changing, to 3 storeys – do they need to go up to 3 storeys in order to build bigger homes? It will block her view and daylight. SHT said the council has a commitment around providing family homes, and that is a key policy for the council. Some of the new homes will be 5 and 6-bedroom homes in order to meet the needs of those on the estate. SHT went on that the new homes would have regard to ensuring the quality of the environment, such as access to daylight. NP said more work would be done to assess sunlight and daylight impact at the next stage of the design work.
- 4.35. **NK said he was happy including more detail on the roofs and refurbishment of homes in Manor Grove in the document;** there is an issue about what the council can afford.

- 4.36. AR asked about other issues that have not been mentioned so far about Manor Grove and his own circumstances. NP established that these related to his property, and MT agreed to look at the issues raised by AR.

5. Local Lettings Scheme

- 5.1. NP said we have not yet seen a written version of it. NK said the principles are in the Offer Document, and this is within the authority of Cllr Pollak. The council will be developing the detail of this following the ballot result.
- 5.2. NP said it is something he thinks residents would like a couple of months to be able to consider and discuss, rather than hear that Cllr Pollak will be making a decision on in a short timescale. It would be useful to have an early draft available to share with residents because it has very different effects on different groups of residents. **NK said he was happy to have a commitment within the Offer Document to do that.**

6. Feedback from:

(a) estate-wide meeting 2.12.20

NK said the council clarified what Option 5 meant for people, and made sure everyone was aware of it. There were some new people there, which was great, and some had different views to what we have heard before. Now that we have got a final option, people are focused on moving forward.

(b) sustainability meeting 16.11.20

- 6.1. There were no questions or comments on what happened at the meeting. NP asked SHT what happens next? SHT said that, on district heating, the network is already operating on a number of estates, we know that it is very reliable and in fact reliability increases with the addition of more homes. There is also the ability to have a back-up system on the estate.
- 6.2. On the Sustainability Strategy, Amy was talking about the kinds of materials that could be used. Net-zero means that energy bills should be lower for the average user. Individual metering of properties is a legal requirement.
- 6.3. The level of detail – including what materials we choose – is what comes next. For example, flood risk and measures for hard and soft landscaping to aid drainage.
- 6.4. NK said it would be great if there are residents who are interested in this area and helping us make this more understandable and meaningful to people, because there is a lot of jargon. AC and FP agreed to help. NK added that Tustin is a pilot for this work across the borough.

(c) Equality and Health Impact Assessment, Cost Benefit and Financial Viability Meeting 25.11.20.

- 6.5. NP asked what happens next. SHT said the information is used to inform decision making throughout the process. It provides information to compare the impacts of

Option 5 and Option 1. It also helps measure social cohesion. LBS will report updates and decision to the Resident Project Group and ensure that what LBS are suggesting meets the equalities principles.

6.6. NK explained the Equalities Impact Assessment will be updated and taken into account at key decision making points.

7. Draft newsletter

7.1. MT talked through the content of the newsletter, and NP asked if there were any comments or questions.

7.2. PK said people were getting a bit confused about the phasing of the works – can it say more about that? **MT agreed to update the newsletter.**

7.3. PK said it would be helpful if the council posted updates on the estate noticeboards, and around the model in the hoarding next to Bowness. NP added that it could be lit so it's visible after dark. PK agreed – most people don't know it's there. **SHT agreed to make more use the noticeboards more around the estate.**

7.4. AC said the section on the Manor Grove design changes need to be improved so that it references exactly where they are along the pedestrian walk. **MT agreed to update the newsletter.**

8. Matters arising from the meeting 12.11.20

NP went through the action points from the previous meeting:

3.4 ACTION: add replacement of commercial property in the recommendation (**Neil**). Completed.

3.5 ACTION: send out draft Landlord Offer and Phasing Plan week beginning 16.11.20. to RPG members (**Neil & Sophie**)
The draft phasing plan was discussed at the meeting with the architects on 2.12.20. Completed.

5.3 ACTION: share details of the draft Lettings scheme with RPG members when Cllr Pollak has made his recommendation (**Mike**)
The offer document contains the details of the Lettings scheme. We are going to see a draft of that in the New Year and the final version after the Ballot in February. **To be discussed at February TEPG Meeting.**

7.1 ACTION: investigate if a virtual tour of Aylesbury over-55 block is possible (**Sophie**)
SHT said a virtual tour of Aylesbury Over 55 Block isn't possible because it isn't built yet. There are restrictions around entering other properties due to Covid-19. We might want to hold a specific session for people who are interested in over-55s accommodation. SHT has got some images she can share.

7.1 ACTIONS: email screenshot of the error message to Seth (**Andy**); then raise the issue with the website designer (**Seth**)

This was done at the meeting. AC he has had a problem getting on the site to register. **SHT will have a look at the mobile display issue.**

9.1 ACTION: produce a timeline showing how and when residents will be able to influence procurement (**Neil**)

NK this would be discussed at the January RPG meeting.

10.2 ACTION: *Below ground survey (4.4):* Sophie said there has been no further progress, and she would update the Group when she has more information.

SHT has not received any further information on this point yet. Outstanding.

10.4 ACTION: *Apprenticeships and social value (7.9):* Sophie and Andrew both said they had been unable to contact Patrick Warren from Engie. Sophie to continue trying to speak with him.

SHT said this information will be shared on the Tustin website.

9. Any Other Business

9.1. SHT said the council is looking to draft and formalise text for another video: what the vote means, how to vote, and what a 'Yes' and a 'No' vote means. She asked if anyone wanted to get involved in helping with this. AC said Emma will volunteer.

10. Date of Next Meeting 14 January 2021

Stephen Moore 15.12.20.