

Minutes of Ledbury Estate Residents Project Group Meeting 4th February 2020

Attendance

RPG

Sue Slaughter	SS		
Patrick Goode	PG	Eileen Basson	EB
Jeanette Mason	JM	Toby Bull	TB
Shelene Byer	SB	Thomas Ennis	TE

LBS

Mike Tyrrell	MT	Abigail Buckingham	AB
Sharon Shadbolt	SSh	Paul Thomas	PT

Others

Charles Hingston	CH	Calford Seaden	
– ITLA			
Ian Simpson	IS	Open Communities - ITLA	

Apologies for Absence:

LBS: Ferenc Morath

1. Introductions and Membership

1.1 Those present introduced themselves.

2.1 NP reported that Alex Hedge had stood down from the RPG due to pressure of work and Val Taylor had stood down as she now had a job with LBS as was concerned about any appearance of a conflict of interest. The RPG recorded their thanks for the contribution of members standing down.

2. Minutes of Previous Meetings

2.1 The minutes of the RPG Meeting of 7 January were agreed as accurate.

3 Update Report – Option Appraisal for Towers

3.1 CH reported that two flats had been identified to construct mock ups to give an idea of the internal dimensions of strengthened flats following works proposed by Arup. They are 29 and 30 Sarnsfield. One will be constructed as if it was a 2 bedroom flat above the 8th floor, and the other as a 1 bedroom flat below the 4th floor.

3.2 The works to the mock ups should be completed by 21 February. When they have been certified as safe, RPG members will be invited to view them and their will be an invitation with set times for residents and former tenants to view them. MT suggested the Ledbury Team will take people to view them by appointment, and this could be done any team up until the ballot on the offer.

3.3 AB made clear the mock ups will show the dimensions of the flats but not the finish. There will have kitchens in but the finishes will not be as any refurbished option would be (at this point not decisions made on final detail , ranges etc.). Publicity about the mock ups to make this clear.

3.4 TE asked whether it would be possible to see the top and bottom of the window as the mock ups will lower the ceiling but not increase the height of

- the floor. CH confirmed that the windows will be marked up to show the size of the openings in a finished flat.
- 3.5 AB reported that LBS staff had met Hunters architects to brief them on what had changed since their previous involvement in 2018. RPG to meet with Hunters on 11.2.20. AB outlined the contents of the Draft Brief for Hunters and asked the RPG for comments.
- 3.6 The costs for Option D will be simplified in the version that is produced for residents as part of the consultation process.
- 3.7 The reason for more Option Appraisal work is the Arup Report on Bromyard, with an increase in costs, and concerns from residents about changes in room sizes.
- 3.8 Para 2.2 to be split at *The wider estate*...The paragraph should make clear the option appraisal is for the existing towers only and should include the estate map with the red line.
- 3.9 P.13 included a list of consultation aids to engage a variety of residents in a variety of different ways. There was a discussion about how much detail should be shown for Options B, C and D that include some newbuild. The TPG supported the production of grey massing diagrams, with limited detail on external appearances with photographs of recent developments giving examples of how balconies, and windows could be organized and look, whether there is core or deck access, and the internal layout, and external appearance.
- 3.10 MT noted 1-7 Hoyland Close needs to be added on p15 to the property list of the Ledbury Estate, along with Pencraig Way.
- 3.11 TB raised concerns that other architects should be invited to tender for the design work at this stage. Councillors were clear they wanted to see new smaller local architects involved in designing new Council homes. The RPG had said it wanted to involve wider residents across the estate in making decisions about design.
- 3.12 AB explained that the work Hunters were being asked to do was to revisit the Option Appraisal. NP noted that the RPG had discussed the issue at the January RPG meeting and had made decision to continue with Hunters for the Option Appraisal process. TB made clear his view that there should be wider consultation on architect selection at this stage.
- 3.13 MT reported that options developed through the Option Appraisal would be developed with residents, and that residents would make the decision on which Option is chosen. The detailed design process would follow the this. The RPG could choose to invite more architects at the stage that detailed design begins, after decisions are made on the Option Appraisal.
- 3.14 TB was expecting the Ledbury Newsletter to give more detail on the work architects are expected to do, so residents are aware that this is a significant decision making point.
- 3.15 MT outlined the Consultation Process set out in the Option Appraisal Brief. Hunters will meet with the RPG on 11.2.20. and there will be a drop in session for residents and ex tenants on 24.2.20 to get feedback on existing new build options. There will be drop in events in March and April to feedback to residents and ex tenants, and get their views on how the options should develop. Further meetings with Hunters and the RPG will be programmed in during this period.

- 3.16 MT explained that during the consultation on options during 2018, residents had been asked what were their favourite refurbishment options, and the most popular options were developed in more detail. The same approach would be used this time for options C and D, which involved some demolition and newbuild. Open Communities will visit residents and ex tenants during the consultation period to make sure residents have the information they need to whittle down the options.
- 3.17 The consultation timetable presented to the RPG with an updated Offer Document, reported to Cabinet in May, and update to Cabinet on whittling down consultation of options in June, with a ballot to choose the final option in July.
- 3.18 MT asked whether there were ways to speed up the process? There was a discussion on whether some options that were less popular in the previous consultation could be eliminated. There was a discussion on which blocks could be demolished and kept if there was partial demolition (Option C). These issues to be examined in more detail as Options are revisited. The time saved appeared minimal. Carrying out clear consultation that everyone understands is most important.
- 3.19 JM asked which options were still in play. MT replied that the Cabinet had asked him to consult on Options A, B, C and D. Councillor Williams had expressed a personal opinion that Option A did not represent the best use of the Council funds, but the Cabinet decision was to consult on all four Options.
- 3.20 SB suggested that to help residents come to a decision on which options they preferred, residents and ex tenants should be asked about their feelings about different options. This would help residents organize their views.
- 3.21 MT explained that the consultation on options would ask residents and ex tenants what was their order of preference. The voting system would be a Single Transferrable Vote (STV) system with one vote per household. When the first choice preferences were counted up, the Option with the least votes would be eliminated and the second choice votes for that preference would be shared between the remaining options. The process would be repeated until the most popular option was chosen. RPG made clear that this must be explained very carefully to residents in the run up to the consultation on options so everyone understands it.
- 3.22 MT made clear that the design of balconies, access, internal layout and appearance would be made by residents working with architects after the Option Appraisal decision was completed.
- 3.23 PG asked who would be able to vote in the ballot. MT made clear that the Cabinet Decision was to consult everyone who has the Right to Return to the Towers, the same households who were consulted during the last consultation. Low Rise residents will be consulted and their views reported to Cabinet. During the previous consultation the highest turnout had been from the Towers residents.
- 3.24 JM was concerned that some households who do not decide to return would be able to influence the decision.
- 3.25 SS asked how many residents had made clear they would not return. MT explained that only two former residents had told the Ledbury Team they do not want to receive the weekly newsletters. Residents have the Right to

Return until homes are refurbished or are built and they are offered a home on Ledbury and asked whether they wish to return or not.

- 3.26 TB asked when the major works for the low rise parts of the estate would be considered as part of this process. There was Councillor support for the Great Estates programme and to integrate proposed works on both low rise and towers to get a high quality and less disruptive outcome. AB replied that the QHIP works for the low rise was programmed for 2023, and when there was a decision on the future of the towers, the Council would consider the low rise Major Works alongside proposed works to the towers.
- 3.27 AB reported that there are LBS Employers Requirements (ER) which set out the standard for new build homes, and these would inform the development of new build options. They take account of the long term maintenance of new buildings as the standards of design. **AB to send LBS ERs to NP for distribution to RPG when they have been approved.**
- 3.28 MT to insert details from original offer to leaseholders in 4.2 of brief.
- 3.29 MT to produce an edition of the Ledbury Newsletter which explains the Architect Brief in detail on 13.2.20.
- 3.30 MT circulated a written Ledbury Update Report. The tenant who had recently accepted an offer has now refused the offer. There has been no movement since the previous meeting.
- 3.31 PG asked about the 2 leaseholders in negotiation.. MT reported one of them is looking to move to a shared equity property and one other is looking for a suitable home to move to.
- 3.32 The Fire Brigade carried out an exercise at Bromyard on 16 January and will carry out a 12 pump exercise on 27 February.
- 3.33 MT reported that there has been a FRA report on the towers that has recommended weekly fire alarm checks. These have begun as part of the regular cycle of work of the Ledbury Team.
- 3.34 There has been one leak in the towers in the last month.

4 Residents Issues

- 4.1 PG asked whether leaseholders moved to new homes would get a 125 lease, or just the length remaining on their existing lease. **MT to raise this issue with Home Ownership.**

5 Matters Arising from the Minutes of 7.1.20.

- 5.1 (3.12) CH agreed to review the proposed programme to see if it could be shortened. **AB to forward the revised timetable to NP to send to RPG members.**
- 5.2 (3.16) **CH and JH to consider LBS Design Standards in future versions of the Options Report.**
- 5.3 (3.28) NP had sent RPG members copies of the final Hunters Report from 2018.
- 5.4 (3.38) MT had brought a paper on consultation of the option appraisal to this meeting.
- 5.5 (3.39) Draft brief for architects had been considered at this meeting.
- 5.6 (6.8) NP had circulated updated RPG Terms of Reference to RPG members.
- 5.7 (7.8) PT to meet with Hyperoptic Supervisor on 5.2.20. to inspect damage at Pencraig Way to inspect damage. PT to meet Cleaning Supervisor on 6.2.20. to consider Pencraig Way deck access flooring.

5.8 Any Other Business

5.9 PG thanked MT for sorting out a service charge query for leaseholders in Ledbury Towers relating to billing for landlord lighting.

6.0 Date of Next Meeting

6.1 3 March 2020

6.2 RPG Meeting with Hunters 11.2.20.

Neal Purvis 5.2.20.