

Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting

Thursday, 8 April 2021 by Zoom

DRAFT MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andrew Eke (TCA chair)	AE	Modupe Somoye (LBS)	M
Andy Chaggar	AC	Olive Green (LBS)	OG
Patrick McDermott	PM	Neil Kirby (LBS)	NK
Paulette Kelly	PK	Sharon Burrell (LBS)	SB
		Sophie Hall-Thompson (LBS)	SHT
Neal Purvis (Open Communities)	NP	Stephen Moore (Open Communities)	SM

1. Introductions and apologies for absence

- 1.1. NP took the Chair and invited all participants to introduce themselves.
- 1.2. Apologies were received from Francis Phillip, Juliette Wodzicki, Amelia Leeson, Betty Thompson, Keith Malyon, and Mike Tyrell (LBS).

2. Minutes of TEPG meeting 11.03.21

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

3. Resident Engagement Plan

- 3.1. SHT said the plan is an attempt to co-ordinate communications across the estate for 2021 and 2022 to meet the council's and residents' objectives. At the moment it is in draft form and requires comment from residents.
- 3.2. The format will remain the same as you've seen in previous meetings – it's a flexible document that will evolve as the programme does. This will help residents, businesses and the school understand how different pieces of the programme slot in with each other. We hope that it provides the clarity needed – and if not, please say.
- 3.3. The methods remain the same as before, subject to Covid-19 regulations. Not everything is established yet – the Tustin Community Website needs to be updated. The council web pages for Tustin will stand still, and direct people to the Tustin Community Website, with the exclusion of the newsletters and the Tustin RPG Minutes.
- 3.4. We are looking to set up a Tustin WhatsApp group to share information in a way that some people prefer. It will not be a conversational tool.
- 3.5. For April and May, SHT proposed to set the date for the Design Sub-Group as the fourth Thursday of the month. This would mean Thursdays become "Tustin Thursdays" with potentially any ad-hoc meetings happening on the first Thursday of the month, the RPG on the second Thursday, the TCA on the third Thursday, and the Design Group on the fourth Thursday.

- 3.6. On estate-wide communications, a feasibility report from the design team Common Grounds is being finalised and should be received early next week. Once we have that we want to begin conversations with residents across the estate.
- 3.7. AC said there seemed to be a lot of overlap between the feedback being given at TCA and RPG meetings – are there differences between the two?
NK said there is a difference between the strategic view of the programme, so we can get on site by next September, and how we take residents with us through that process. The strategic direction comes through the TCA and the detail goes through the RPG.
- 3.8. AC asked if that was the main difference – the level of detail, rather than the topics discussed? NK said it varies; there are some key decisions which are strategic, like the appointment of the architects, and making sure residents are engaged through the process. He welcomed residents' views; on this approach.
- 3.9. AC said he would like for all residents in Manor Grove to receive invitations to both TCA and RPG meetings so they have the option of attending both in future. *Post meeting note – Manor Grove residents who have asked for invites are sent papers for all RPG meetings.*
ACTION: TCA to consider who is invited to their meetings (TCA).
- 3.10. AE said the council needed to implement its policy of putting residents first so they are not overwhelmed with information. NP said this approach was very effective for residents during the major works in the towers. AE said that if we've learned anything from 2019, it's to avoid residents getting burnt out with an overload of information.
SHT agreed to consider this. LBS will hold a learning meeting with Towers residents possibly 6 May. NK added that as a resident-led process LBS is trying to find a way of working sensibly without overloading residents. Constantly reviewing the Resident Engagement Plans is one way to ensure people know what's going on and which meeting to go to.
- 3.11. SHT said the Housing Needs Survey has now started with Hillbeck. In May it will move on to Kentmere, then Heversham, Manor Grove and Bowness. Also in May there will be detailed work and discussion for the RPG on the social value strategy and potentially on sustainability. Antithesis, who are working with us on the sustainability strategy, want to do a resident-led project around sustainable practise; those ideas need to be generated with residents (for example recycling/mending clothes, bike maintenance, etc) and the RPG can help with this. The sustainability strategy will comprise work around employment, young people, older people, health and wellbeing.
- 3.12. LBS want to get the coffee mornings back up and running for conversations and some community, in June. Locations and dates will be confirmed in due course.
- 3.13. LBS hope we can have a dedicated young people's event (for 16-30-year-olds) in August and we're seeking ideas on what that will look like. In September we want to hold a dedicated over-55s event.
- 3.14. We hope to have the architects in place by July, so the detailed design work that residents want to see can start taking place. In September we have a dedicated meeting scheduled for Manor Grove residents around refurbishment standards. There will be a series of in-person drop-in events and online too, around the detail of the designs.

- 3.15. In June we hope to be able to share the rehousing process on a step-by-step basis, with an estate-wide meeting in June or July.
- 3.16. We estimate to have the delivery partner on board by the end of 2021, and there will be an opportunity to meet and set the tone and the resident-led targets with that partner.
- 3.17. PK asked what will happen around engaging with all residents if the proposed coffee mornings are still not possible due to Covid-19 restrictions? Things are going at breakneck speed in order to get planning permission by the time set in the schedule. SHT said there would be continued support from the Tustin and Ledbury team, maintaining telephone contact with residents, Zoom meetings and face-to-face meetings which would have to be reviewed to ensure accordance with Covid-19 restrictions. The new WhatsApp group will also help disseminate information. Questionnaires and surveys will provide feedback, undertaken by the design team. Drop-in events by the design team will take place where feasible, but will be kept under review. NP added that a lesson from last year was that each time there is a relaxation in the Covid-19 restrictions, teams need to be ready to move quickly to make the best of the time, because the window of opportunity can be just a few months. SHT said virtual tours and videos will also be used effectively in the process.

4. **Draft Procurement Strategy for Main Contractor**

- 4.1. NP clarified that the strategy is wider than just the main contractor it is procurement for the whole redevelopment project.
- 4.2. SHT said this strategy is intended to increase transparency and awareness of the steps that are taking place. Continuity and quality are key factors, as is building the resident-led criteria into the tenders and contracts of the project. There are number of pieces of work that the Council will procure. One of the appointments will be the independent homeowners' and tenants' advisor. We have Open Communities' services at the moment, but to ensure LBS are testing the market, checking the latest ideas and checking those costs and ensuring this is a sound procurement strategy, LBS will be going out to competitive tender on that in May, inviting three or four practices to tender.
NK added that this is no criticism of what is in place at the moment, more ensuring that the council is being robust so it cannot be challenged by anyone that it hasn't followed the right route.
- 4.3. Regarding re-procuring these services, AE said that just after the whittling down process was discussed, around October/November 2020, there was mention of something like this, and asked LBS to check the minutes of those meetings before changing anything, as the council has already made a commitment.
NK agreed to check this and clarify if there is any difference between the two positions, and to put it in writing if there is a difference, adding they have tried to be consistent all the way through, and the project has been evolving over time.
ACTION: NK to check minutes of October and November RPG meetings regarding re-procurement of the contract for the independent homeowners' and tenants' advisor.
- 4.4. **Design team:** SHT said the scope of the works for the design team will take us from where we are now, what's known as RIBA Stage 1, to a planning application ready for submission (RIBA Stage 3). We're hoping to get the architects appointed in July,

with a view to work with all parties including residents to make a planning application in January 2021.

- 4.5. Southwark Council now has an architectural design framework in place. This reduces the time to make an appointment, as a number of financial and tendering checks have already been carried out. The Council must follow the law in choosing contractors.
- 4.6. NP clarified that the system was OJEU (Official Journal of the European Union), but the UK Government website now calls it “Find Me A Tender” with no mention of the EU. NK confirmed the two processes are identical. AE asked when new procurement rules will come into effect, due to Brexit. NP said the EU’s existing rules will be adopted into UK law and remain in effect until and unless the UK Government replaces them.
- 4.7. For the construction of homes, a ‘lot’ of 12 architects have been pre-selected to be on the framework. The issue for the council is that DSDHA, Common Grounds and Hayhurst & Co aren’t on that ‘lot’. Common Ground could decide if and how to join forces with any of the practices in the ‘lot’. We’d be looking to encourage consortiums like this as it brings strengths and support to the local economy.
- 4.8. There will be a two-step, mini-competition with an Expression of Interest phase, then the release of the tender. In the first step, we would like residents to be able to comment on the Expression of Interest summary briefs, and that’s something we’d like to take to the Design Sub-Group. We’d also like residents to give input to the Design Brief that would then be shared with the winning practice.
- 4.9. We could have up to 12 practices putting forward their proposals in the Expression of Interest phase. The council would whittle those down to the three which it confidently believes can best deliver what residents and the council are looking for. At that point we would set up an exhibition for residents as part of the evaluation process, in-person and online. We’d welcome ideas on how best to open this up to residents. We would also set up a resident-led stakeholder panel, to include a representative from the school and businesses.
- 4.10. NP said the schedule suggests that the successful architects would only have from July until January to work up a planning application. Are there ways this appointment could be made more quickly? NK said this schedule is as quick as LBS can get to without rushing it too much. In the meantime LBS need to have discussions with TfL and the GLA and we are buying some of that service from DSDHA, which gives us a level of continuity. For the school we need to apply to the Secretary of State for permission to make changes to the school – we are working with Hayhurst on that – and looking at what surveys we can do now on the estate so they’re ready for the Design Team. We’re looking to see what we can break out of that larger package of work to get on with now.
- 4.11. AE asked if it’s possible for NP or NK to share lessons learned from previous similar projects. NK said he’d be happy to bring some of the lessons learnt to the next RPG. We understand from the RPG and the TCA the need for continuity, but there is an issue around procurement and the cost of that contract; LBS need to act within the law, so there is no challenge that could delay the process.
ACTION: NK to bring summary of lessons learnt to next RPG meeting.
- 4.12. **Delivery partner:** SHT said the delivery partner is needed to demolish, build and refurbish homes and carry out the landscaping work, sell the homes allocated

for private sale. The value of this contract will be very high, so LBS need to ensure we are managing the risks and challenges outlined already. LBS will use a developer-contractor framework to get an organisation appointed as quickly as possible. The benefits are that the contractor would provide finance for the initiative and building the private-sale homes, alongside experience of selling homes on the open market. Disadvantages include that private sector organisations are more keenly aware of profit than the council would be. The scheme will remain a council and resident-led scheme.

- 4.13. We estimate the total cost of the Tustin scheme to be about £290million; the council's finances have been heavily hit by the Covid-19 crisis, and we have been working through the best way to deliver the scheme. There will be a report to the Council's Cabinet on this in July, LBS have been working out how much grant money we can get from the GLA, and the developer would bring in private finance to pay for the construction of the homes for sale. The contract will set out the detail of how this works between the council and the contractor. The council will lead the process and be accountable to residents for that process.
- 4.14. NP raised the prospect that the private developer may look to squeeze money and cut corners on the private-sale homes, thereby creating homes that are not safe and are adjoining higher-quality council homes. NK said that was something the council is very aware of, that there have been lots of discussions about safety in light of the Grenfell disaster, and there will be a design quality check all the way through the process, on all the homes built. Any efficiencies in the build process will not be at the expense of quality nor safety. The council will be a very demanding client.
- 4.15. AE asked if the Southwark Standard for housing was higher than the national standard?
NK said the design standards are higher than the GLA policy for new homes. We've been looking at how we can build zero-carbon homes and we believe our homes are a higher standard than the normal Government guidance, and certainly higher than new homes built elsewhere in the country.
- 4.16. AE said we found disparities in the quality of homes that were sold as 'affordable' and 'non-affordable', for example.
NK assured him that all new council homes will be of the highest quality possible.
- 4.17. NP asked if anyone had any more comments or questions, but there were none.
- 4.18. NP asked if there was any possibility of a contract for Tustin going to a new construction company owned by the GLA if one was set up – as promised in Sadiq Khan's election manifesto?
NK said there isn't at the moment – any such company would take a while to be established, and the GLA has not placed any such conditions on its grant. The GLA would also have to take legal advice on which schemes go to that company, and via what process.
- 4.19. **Equalities and Health:** SHT said this is a low-value piece of work, an update to work already completed by Mott MacDonald. We'd like to extend their services to update the existing information and review our policies from an E&H point of view. NK said the council would welcome comments and views from residents on how to improve the contract, as they've been pushing the contractor to engage with

residents. They await a proposal from Mott MacDonald for the new contract, to include social value commitments to benefit the estate's residents.

NP said some feedback from residents was that information Mott MacDonald presented was difficult to digest initially, but did improve. AE seconded this view.

- 4.20. **Sustainability:** SHT said Antithesis is working on the sustainability strategy but additional work elements are needed including around the heat load for SELCHP to ensure it can meet the expected demand and accessing grants from the council's Carbon Offset Fund for energy efficiency improvement works as part of the Manor Grove refurbishments. There are also pieces of work to be included in the planning application and for the GLA assessing the whole life cycle of the scheme. It needs to be considered if Anthesis contract is extended to do this work and how this sits alongside design work. This will be brought back to the RPG.

- 4.21. NP said the Sustainability work is narrowly drawn, focused on issues around heating, but residents are interested in wider sustainability issues – valuing the mature trees and some wildlife on the estate. Is that going to feature in the Sustainability work, or somewhere else in the work in coming months? SHT said this is something that will come out in discussion for the Design Brief with architects. LBS will also be doing ecology and habitat surveys now – also considerations including flood management, green spaces, biodiversity, urban heat islands. NK added that they need to also make sure LBS are aware of the impact of any changes to the heating set-up on the existing system for residents, as well as reducing the number of heating outages currently.

- 4.22. AE asked if there had been consideration of electric car charging ports? SHT said it is part of the Sustainability strategy; there is a recommendation already that needs to be taken further. AE said there has been a request by residents in the Towers for six charging points – there are Government grants available for these, and we would prefer the systems across the estate to be seamless. SHT agreed.

ACTION: AE to invite SHT to the next Three Towers RPG to discuss.

5. Local Lettings and Rehousing Strategy

- 5.1. SHT said the strategy needs residents' sign-off before it is sent to Cllr Cryan and officially adopted by the council. After that, the details will be presented at an estate-wide meeting. The principles and aims are in the Landlord Offer Document.
- 5.2. Once the strategy is adopted, we can start work with Hillbeck residents. They'll be given a priority 'Band 1' status and offered one of the refurbished homes in the towers, or one of the new 'hidden homes' at the bottom of the towers. Details of these homes will be shared in a booklet, which will also outline the rent, service charges, and details of disturbance payments and home loss payments. Residents can select a preference based on their housing and medical needs. Residents will be offered either a permanent and temporary move, allowing them to either stay or move again into a permanent new home in Hillbeck.
- 5.3. Phase 2 will see residents being allowed to move home in summer 2023 ahead of work beginning in 2024. They would be given 'Band 1' status and be able to move directly into a newly-built home on the estate. In Phase 3, homes on the site of Heversham will be built.

- 5.4. The strategy extends to both tenants and leaseholders, is intended to keep residents together, and will be flexible that can be updated as people's lives change. All tenants in homes due to be demolished will be guaranteed a new home on the estate on a like-for-like basis, allocated based on their housing need and length of residency on the estate.
- 5.5. OG said the Ledbury and Tustin Team will need to inform and support residents still receiving legacy benefits, who will be moved over to Universal Credit at the point they move home by default.
- 5.6. OG added that Covid-19 has caused a 7-month backlog of tenants registered as wanting to move home; we will speak to the team leader to work out an expedited process for residents on Tustin. AE said Mike Tyrell assured residents at a meeting the previous evening that he has a strategy to deal with this issue already – please can they liaise with him on this first?
AE also asked how soon the draft of the Strategy will be ready? OG said she cannot give a timescale at present.
NP said it needs to pull everything together and give a clear idea across the whole estate; the new homes at the bottom of the towers are likely to be ready in the summer so progress is needed as lots of residents will be interested.
- 5.7. AE asked what happens to private tenants of non-resident leaseholders under this strategy, if they are on the Housing Register? NP clarified that promises have been made to this group in the Offer Document and meetings in the past that are not reflected in the draft Strategy. It needs to be clear in this document what would be offered to this group, who have been on the Register for at least 12 months.
- 5.8. AC picked up on a typo/discrepancy in p15 of the draft Strategy document – the headings for points 17 and 19. **ACTION: NP said he would pick this up along with other detailed comments and circulate them among other RPG members.**
- 5.9. NP said leaseholders will be interested to see the latest iteration of the Strategy document when the next meeting is held for them. It would also be useful to flag up in the next Estate Newsletter as there have been lots of detailed questions about the rehousing process and this is the first time it's been set out in this level of detail – perhaps include a link to view it online. **ACTION: SHT agreed to include mention of the draft Strategy in the next Estate Newsletter.**
- 5.10. NP asked when the Strategy would next be redrafted, and what happens with it then? SHT said it would be pulled into a policy document that will then be agreed by Cllr Cryan so it becomes council policy. **ACTION: SHT agreed to bring an updated version to the next RPG meeting for comment.**

6. Outline of Design Brief

- 6.1. SHT said the first step, the Expression of Interest, will be a high-level summary document with the Resident Manifesto and Feasibility Study from Common Ground as appendices. It's a chance for the design teams to prove they understand the brief. The detailed brief will come when they are appointed.
- 6.2. NP said the Design Brief was not understandable or accessible for residents due to the numerous acronyms. **ACTION: SHT agreed to revise the Design Brief to make it easier to understand.**
- 6.3. NP asked how the Feasibility Study will be shared with residents, ensuring it is understandable and accessible. **ACTION: SHT agreed to create a summary of**

updates and how/where it goes beyond the Landlord Offer Document, to accompany the substantial Feasibility Study.

6.4. AE said workshops were successful last time in getting resident engagement. 3D models were also very well received. SHT welcomed the suggestion.

7. Report from Estate-wide Meeting of 7th April

7.1. NP said most people present tonight were at the meeting; he has sent round the slides to all RPG members the updated version of the slides shown last night. Anyone with questions or comments about them can come to him.

7.2. AC said the advertising for the meeting itself gave very little notice – flyers were delivered the same day. More notice would be appreciated, as per the agreed Engagement Plan. SHT said they were trying to achieve a week's notice, rather than a day's notice.

8. Draft newsletter

8.1. SHT talked through the content of the draft newsletter. Mike Tyrell had said there had been significant changes made to it since. **ACTION: An updated version will be shared by SHT or OG tomorrow for comment.**

9. Matters arising from the meeting of 11th March

9.1. 3.10 **ACTION: ask interested neighbours to contact Sophie or Neal (all members). Neal to organise meeting for RPG members and other residents on process and content of a planning application.**

A Design Sub-Group has been scheduled for the fourth Thursday in April.

9.2. 3.12 **ACTION: Neil to raise this with Sylvester Hylton from LBS Asset Management (Neil).**

NK has spoken with Sylvester, they are working out how to work it into the Manor Grove discussions when they get under way. **ACTION: Once agreed, NK to explain to RPG where and how the lessons are going to be used.**

9.3. 3.17 **ACTION: produce 4 a second newsletter in March giving more detail on social value and employment opportunities (Mike).**

Completed.

9.4. 6.4 **ACTION: promote the OKR team and the consultation on the Area Action Plan on the Tustin website (Sophie).**

ACTION: NP suggests mention is included in the next newsletter that there is one month left to contribute to the consultation – and where sub-group 4 is in the document (Mike Tyrell).

9.5. 8.2 **Impact of Bakerloo line on estimated values (para 7.2) still being explored (Neil)**

NK said this can be discussed at the leaseholder meeting. The timescale is more than the next 7 years so it will probably have a limited impact.

9.6. 8.3 **Council rents for decanted leaseholders (7.3) – response expected in April (Neil).**

ACTION: NK said there is no current council policy on this. Once clarified in the next

couple of weeks, it will be put in writing to the RPG, TCA, fed back via the leaseholders' meeting and included in the Local Lettings Policy. AE said the council has already set a precedent on this.

9.7. *8.4 Manor Grove pitched roofs (7.5) – leave in minutes until Design Team in place.* NP said this will be picked up in discussion of design and refurbishment of Manor Grove.

9.8. *8.5 Local lettings scheme (7.6) – bring a draft to the April RPG (Mike).* Comments on first draft will now feed into second draft.

9.9. *8.6 Social value (7.8) – co-ordination of work between major work contractor working on Tustin Towers and the Regeneration proposals. - still no reply received from Engie (Neil).* AE said there has been forward momentum but not fully resolved – remains outstanding.

9.10. *9.1 ACTION: arrange for outstanding minutes to be uploaded (Sophie).* SHT said this should happen in the next couple of days. NP said it was crucial to publish minutes soon after meetings are held, to build confidence among estate residents and the wider community that the council's engagement process is genuinely meaningful.

10. Any Other Business

10.1. AC asked for updates on the trial pits surveys. SHT said the pits were dug in January but they'd had significant difficulty getting access to No. 81 Manor Grove to dig an internal pit. It's now due to take place next week and final reports giving a conclusive view will follow. ***ACTION: Re: final reports, SHT to provide date by email once confirmed.***

10.2. AE asked if NK could ensure residents are given plenty of notice to allow re-letting garages in Manor Grove. ***ACTION: NK will pick this up with the Garages Team.***

11. Date of next meeting – 13th May