

Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting

Thursday 13 January 2022 at 6pm

Present

Jessica	Je
Tonia Tkachenko (drMM)	TT
Andrew Eke (TCA Chair)	AE
Andy Rodriguez	AR
Neil Kirby (LBS)	NK
Susan Du Toit (LBS)	SDT
Neil Onions (Beyond the Box)	NO
Steve Wallis (drMM)	SW
Michael (drMM)	M
Paul Adams (Pulse)	PA
Judith Stichtenoeth (drMM)	JS
Hema Vashi (LBS)	HV
Paulette Kelly	PK
Amelia Leeson	AL
Neal Purvis (Open Communities)	NP
Andy Chaggar	AC
Eleanor Begley	EB
Mike Tyrrell (LBS)	MT
Manon Smits (Linkcity)	MS
Sharon Burell (LBS)	SB
Modupe Somoye (LBS)	MS
Sophie Williams (LBS)	SA
Sabi Ibn-Ibrahim (LBS)	SI

1. Apologies for Absence

1.1 Murselin Islam – Open Communities

2 Minutes of TEPG meeting 9.12.21.

2.1 There were no amendments to the previous minutes, agreed as accurate.

3 Feedback from the Design team

3.1 NK reported LBS are heading towards Planning Application submission in mid March. drMM will provide an explanation of what the changes will be post exhibition. LBS are looking for a residents views on these. LBS will continue to update RPG and then resume coffee mornings, design meetings (if covid allows) and continue to update the designs.

- 3.2 TT reported that resident feedback has been collated into a document shared with residents. TT shared a presentation. This presentation collated the key topics discussed and how the design is picking up those comments. The key strategies drMM would like agreement on are: masterplan, landscape plan, movement and energy strategy. There are some more detailed elements included in the presentation on materiality, and floorplans of homes.
- 3.3 TT explained the Tustin Estate Website maintenance role has been taken on by two residents.
- 3.4 TT outlined that this is a busy time coming up to planning submission. During January and February the developing designs will be reviewed by GLA. There is ongoing review with LinkCity. The Design Team are hoping to reach a fixed design at the end of January. This will give one month for review by all the designers. There will be an updated design document circulated to all residents in February.
- 3.5 NK reported that after planning consent in the summer, LBS will produce a revised document that summarises the council's offer to all residents. Details can change during the Planning Process so it is only when the Planning Consent has been received that this can be produced.
- 3.6 PK Asked if there was much resident feedback from the form in the Design Booklet distributed in December? TT replied there were no forms returned, but drMM did receive some emails.
- 3.7 SW explained how designs have developed since the Feasibility Study that Common Grounds produced. drMM are working on the Phasing strategy with LinkCity as the contractor. The layout of proposed buildings is the same as previously, but the change in colour on the map is a change in sequence in how the construction is carried out. (1) Yellow buildings are as they've always been. (2) Blue. (3) Orange. (4) Green, final phase.
- 3.8 In response to a question from NP SW explained there is no change in moving dates for phase 1, and the dates for phases 2, 3, and 4 are in line with what has been presented previously.
- 3.9 AL asked if in phase 1 will everyone who isn't in the towers will be relocated? SW replied, Yes, that is correct.
- 3.10 NK explained there is a slight reduction of the numbers of homes in block C (Hillbeck and Ullswater). Phase 1 will be predominantly council rent and if there is a need for shared equity LBS will include that too.
- 3.11 NP Will people be able to stay in the part of the estate they live in now if they want to? NK replied that Yes, that's a key part in our strategy, that hasn't changed.
- 3.12 SW outlined the emerging character throughout the estate. Different areas of the estate will have different feelings and character. The aim is to make sure the new buildings work with the existing buildings but have individual character. There are four key character areas. Blue, specific to Old Kent Road for tall

buildings, shops, active area. Green (Ilderton road) acts as a buffer, character much more residential, low rise and defined by gardens between the buildings. Pink (Manor Grove) low rise. Yellow in the Tustin common area, with the school, housing, communal orientation of the park, contrasting material with the curved school. SW showed photographs of examples.

- 3.13 AL asked that she got the impression at the design meeting that some of these weren't feasible, such as brick fronting, how realistic are they?
- 3.14 SW replied the Old Kent Road area is about the form or height of buildings. The residential areas are more low rise, repetitive.
- 3.15 SW Brick is definitely something we've been looking at. The first areas designed will give an idea of this. TT explained that for the planning application in March we're working in more detail for phase 1. The other areas will have more detailed design at a later stage. AL noted that it would be nice to understand the design of the different areas with more detail.
- 3.16 TT explained for the design of phase 1 - costing and construction of materials is being assessed by LinkCity in terms of feasibility, viability, sustainability.
- 3.17 AE asked if the junction of Old Kent Road and Ilderton road - Afrikiko site was included in the Planning Application?
- 3.18 NK reported that LBS have been talking to the owners but there is no agreement at present so the site is not owned by LBS and is outside the Planning Application area.
- 3.19 AE reminded those present that there will be a Drop in session for residents to be able to select materials. NK agreed. **There will be a session with material samples and details will be subject to a lot more consultation with the people who will live in each block.**
- 3.20 SW showed the routes through the site. Tustin walk is the key pedestrian walk. We've been working with the traffic engineer to make sure vehicle movement and street parking is accessible for all residents, but also safety in the park for pedestrians only. A lot of the parking is located along the new north-south street, the extension of Hillbeck Close. There will be 187 parking spaces, which is a 3% increase given the new homes. Residents that have parking permits will retain their parking permits. Only new residents that have a demonstrable need for parking (wheelchair) will get parking.
- 3.21 NP noted that some of the residents in Manor Grove and Heversham were concerned about parking at the end of Ilderton road so providing more parking there would address their needs. SW confirmed that there will be clarity on those parking spaces in 2 weeks.
- 3.22 SW drew residents' attention to the location of Commercial Space in the new development marked in Pink along the Old Kent and Ilderton Road.
- 3.23 NP Will there be restaurants and bars close to the new Hillbeck?
- 3.24 SW There will be flats above commercial buildings with better acoustic

barriers than now.

- 3.25 NP noted that the issue is not just noise in the building but when people leave at night. SW replied management of this will be taken into account in the planning process
- 3.26 AL explained she lives directly above a restaurant, and doesn't have a problem with noise in the restaurant. Disturbance is from the bottles and rubbish being put out at 1am. There is a problem with ventilation.
- 3.27 SW explained Block J for older residents will have commercial spaces under it.
- 3.28 AE was concerned about commercial space on Ilderton road which will be in a controlled parking zone, it might affect the residents with deliveries etc. SW replied that this is something drMM are working on with the traffic consultant.
- 3.29 NK noted the intention is not to increase the commercial spaces, but to replace the existing and to design them better. Given Bowness will still be there for a number of years, **NK agreed to look at what LBS can do to improve the health of residents in Bowness in the meantime.** LBS will also speak to commercial residents and see what they want to do.
- 3.30 SW shows Masterplan Landscape slide. The Tustin park will be the main common area. There will be a play street. drMM have done their best to keep existing trees. There are dog-walking trails, Over 55s homes in block C with private gardens. There has been a lot of work looking at gardens that surround the buildings in block C and G to make sure there is play provision, quiet spaces and functional spaces, bike storage.
- 3.31 AC asked at Manor Grove, originally the plans were looking to keep alleyways and now the back gardens are adjoining.
- 3.32 NK replied that Manor Grove is the most complicated design challenge because of current freeholders. There hasn't been a decision on that. We'll be looking with residents with Manor Grove, and Kentmere at the best design solution.
- 3.33 AC In the document that was circulated it planned cycle parking in the gardens of Manor Grove tenants. If there isn't direct access to gardens that will affect cycle parking. NK replied that makes sense and the design will take this into account.
- 3.34 SW explained there is lots of different play areas designed into the plan. Blue areas show space provided as courtyard playspace.
- 3.35 SW noted there were lots of comments from consultation about the roofscape. There will be Green roofs as much as possible (shown in green). Terrace area that is residents only (yellow). Potential rooftop Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) pitch in the school.
- 3.36 SW noted the developing the lighting strategy. There will be a mixture of Low level lighting, high level lighting and feature lighting. There had been comments on safety, and visibility across the estate.

- 3.37 AE From experience, low lighting can become useless with shrubs growing. High level lighting can also be used to site ~CCTV cameras, so this is probably better.
- 3.38 AE asked if the Roof terrace for block C would be accessible for everyone? SW replied it will be accessible for all the residents. Over 55s will have a groundfloor garden for them.
- 3.39 SW showed that Security and Privacy would include fences and greening to create buffer space so people have privacy in their homes. NP noted there has been an issue with maintenance by the Council of fences. Long term maintenance needs to be thought about. SW replied this will be taken into consideration.
- 3.40 TT explained that the proposed Over 55s accommodation is in two locations. It is crucial to provide homes for current over 55s as part of phase 1. Hence decision to locate some over 55s in block C (Ullswater replacement). This part of the building will have its own entrance, hall and garden. There will be around 40 homes for over 55s. Additional over 55s in phase 4 in building J (next to Bowness arch). Both of the locations benefit from access to Old Kent Road, close to the new tube stop and communal space for over 55s.
- 3.41 NP welcomed over 55s homes in phase 1, it had been a common question.
- 3.42 AE was concerned that Over 55s don't want to be exposed to all the, the noise. That was why we settled on the original location. Empire Lounge is about to expand so traffic, noise and anti social behaviour around Iceland car park is going to increase. Over 55s need shelter from noise pollution and anti-social behaviour. At the general meeting in Nov 2020 people wanted peace and quiet, private gardens. I think that the proposal for Block C needs to be double checked.
- 3.43 TT set out the plan is for Bowness to be demolished after phase 1. The commercial properties on Old Kent Road won't be there. Block C is slightly removed from Old Kent road.
- 3.44 NK replied that LBS need to look at a buffer between Empire Lounge and block C. LBS need to look at how environmental issues are addressed in regards to Empire Lounge.
- 3.45 TT showed some flat layout for over 55s homes. There are 1.5 bedrooms for this type of home, with space for a visitor/carer to stay in the home. The half bedrooms will be provided with windows.
- 3.46 SDT noted that 1.5 bedrooms where the half bedroom is under 7.5 m2 will not be charged as a bedroom.
- 3.47 MK The 1.5 bedroom flat will be charged as a 1 bedroom flat and will not be subject to a bedroom tax.
- 3.48 TT Flats will be heated by district heating networks. Heat comes from burning waste at SELCHP. Residents had raised concerns with reliability. In the event of a breakdown of SELCHP, there will be an emergency generator. Underfloor heating

- / radiators were discussed with residents. Radiators were preferred as they are easier to repair and leaks are easy to identify.
- 3.49 AE asked about the contribution of solar? TT replied the design is looking at placing as many solar panels as possible across the estate, and the energy will be fed into the landlord supply.
- 3.50 TT explained design at Plot C, where Ullswater and Hillbeck is now. The design is to have minimum impact on Sylvan Grove in terms of light. This is part of the building that will house the over 55s. It keeps existing trees at the Manor Grove end. #
- 3.51 AC asked for clarification is northside of plot C 5 stories? TT replied it is and will check all images show the same version.
- 3.52 TT outlined the Plot C waste storage and cycle storage. There is Communal space away from the street. There has been lots of feedback about legibility of entrances at consultation, so the design proposals take account of that. drMM are also creating a palette to add colour by painting metal, glazed tiles.
- 3.53 TT explained that Plot G1 Entrances have two stairs and two lifts for flexibility. Materials - looking for natural materials in response to residents. Hallways are naturally lit.
- 3.54 AE noted that many residents are not keen on metal balconies. PK agreed. They are messy and they lack privacy. Something more solid is more popular.
- 3.55 NP Long term maintenance for metalwork can be a problem. The Council have not always maintained this well on other estates.
- 3.56 TT replied that the design will take account of privacy. It will need to consider daylight. NP noted that if there is not privacy on the balconies, residents will put up a screen which can be a fire risk. He suggested frosted glass could work for privacy and light. Toughened glass had been used on the balconies at the towers.
- 3.57 TT Plot D (Manor Grove). The designers are thinking about materiality and colours, and what happens at Manor Grove during construction. Keeping the corridors into Tustin from the North.
- 3.58 TT set out 3 strategies with different levels of refurbishment for Manor Grove tenants.
- 3.59 AR asked if flat or pitched roofs were proposed for Manor Grove tenants? Leakage is the main problem in Manor Grove.
- 3.60 TT reported on the options considered. In option 2 and 3 LBS will refurbish the roofs, upgrading them to modern flat roof systems with solar panels and green roofs. We need to think about how the refurbished properties fit next to the private properties that won't change.
- 3.61 NP explained at the design meeting there was a roof specialist. **NP to send details of roof proposals to AR.**
- 3.62 TT identified the proposed Landscape improvements looking at drainage,

- private alleyways, with communal planting.
- 3.63 AR noted the original reinforcing rods in the concrete is showing through where there has been leakage.
- 3.64 NP explained the stock conditions survey included a concrete survey and there were details on how the concrete will be repaired and where. **NP to send AR the concrete survey.**
- 3.65 How would the leaks and brickwork be repaired in the Manor Grove works?
- 3.66 TT replied that these concerns have been taken into account. If there are issues identified in certain areas they will be dealt with.
- 3.67 AR noted the drainage pipe is inside his home, which is creating mould.
- 3.68 NP reported that the proposals for Manor Grove include replacement and repair of existing services, improving insulation and ventilation. Council are aware of problems with leakage and damp.
- 3.69 TT explained the plans for Manor Grove include interior refurbishment. The 3 options are currently being discussed with Linkcity for feasibility, cost, and environmental issues.
- 3.70 NP asked when will the individual tenants be consulted the specification for particular issues in their homes? It would be useful to let Manor Grove residents know when those surveys will take place.
- 3.71 AC noted in his home there was asbestos in the artex in the ceiling.
- 3.72 TT outlined the surveys completed and CCTV, drainage, environmental surveys that are ongoing. NP had forwarded Specialists surveys to RPG members. He is producing a summary guide for residents.

4 Resident Engagement Plan from Council

- 4.1 SDT reported that at present the Council is unable to do face-face engagement due to Covid guidance. She hopes this will start these again in February. The Team have been doing phone consultations with residents.
- 4.2 The next design sub-group meeting we'll look at internal layouts and materials. Along with the design process generally and how that's dealt with.
- 4.3 SDT Hopes the coffee mornings will restart in February and these will show the updated designs. SDT asked for feedback on timings. They used to be 11am-5pm?
- 4.4 In February LinkCity will be doing a presentation on how they will be working with residents and the social value program.
- 4.5 NP Asked when will the final design for the planning application be presented to residents? SDT replied this will be presented in the coffee mornings. NK added there will a targetted consultation for Manor Grove and Kentmere. AC asked for a reasonable period of notice for this.
- 4.6 NP asked if there would be an evening and Saturday consultation so more people have access to design before the planning application submission?

- 4.7 NK replied LBS will share the presentation of the updated design for March planning application at the coffee mornings. In the summer LBS will present a detailed booklet to share with residents. NP noted that for people at work they cannot attend coffee mornings. **NK agreed to organise a targeted evening consultation session.**
- 4.8 NP Could suggested that the information could be provided face to face with residents rather than residents coming to LBS.
- 4.9 MT reported that 6 residents have already moved. LBS are working on hidden homes. 2 leaseholders have come to an agreement with the council in Hillbeck.
- 4.10 AE asked if there is any problem that may cause potential delays? And whether this is under control?
- 4.11 MT replied that he couldn't say there haven't been problems. Any issues arising LBS are dealing with.
- 4.12 NK updated on the Hidden homes. There are issues getting power into the properties. LBS want to get them ready so people can view them. We are looking at ways of pre-allocating those properties.
- 4.13 AE They need to be completed fully so people can see them finished. Brexit has been an issue for manpower. The TCA are talking to the Director of Engie to see if they can get more manpower on the construction.
- 4.14 SdT reported that the hoarding of Ullswater had begun and LBS and LinkCity are currently working on getting options and costings for a digital noticeboard.
- 4.15 NK reported that LBS are working on local letting scheme for the hidden homes, and key worker housing. **NK to bring the list of key worker categories to the next RPG. LBS Officer leading on Local Lettings will attend February RPG Meeting.**
- 4.16 There was no further update on Manor Grove.
- 4.17 AE suggested a Manor Grove meeting to connect with the tenants. We need to make sure we maintain the momentum and keep people informed. People living in dangerous situations. This could look at the survey questions that would be used to identify the individual refurbishment needs in each Council tenanted home. **Manor Grove meeting to be organised.**
- 4.18 MT apologised for the late circulation of the Draft Newsletter, which incorporates all the details TT shared.
- 4.19 NP to circulate Draft Newsletter to RPG members with a deadline to respond to MT by Wed 19th Jan, 5pm.

5 Matters Arising from Meeting 9/12/21

- 5.1 (7.2) There had been an update on Over 55s Accommodation at this meeting.
- 5.2 **(7.5) Local Lettings Scheme – Outstanding Item.**
- 5.3 **(7.6) Meeting of Design Team and Engie. TT to organise. Outstanding.**
- 5.4 (7.7) Electronic Notice Board – to be installed on Ullswater hoarding.

5.5 (7.8) Housing Management into Engagement Plan. Resident Services Area Office have been informed. Action they will take are yet to be agreed.

6 Items of any other business

6.1 AE to invite the company providing the electric charging points at the towers to the next RPG. This offers benefits to residents across the estate.

7 Date of Next Meeting

7.1 Thursday 10th February at 6pm.

Eleanor Begley
14.1.22.