

Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting
Thursday 12 November 2020 by Zoom

MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Andrew Eke	AE	Sandra Francis	SF
Andy Chaggar	AC		
Amelia Leeson	AL	Sharon Burrell (Southwark Council)	SB
Comfort Kumi	CK	Modupe Somoye (Southwark Council)	MS
Francis Phillip	FP	Seth Scarfe-Smith (Common Grounds)	SSS
Jess Horwill	JH	David Hills (Common Grounds)	DH
John Sankah	JS	Ian Simpson (Open Comms, minutes)	IS
Juliette Wodzicki	JW	Mike Tyrell (Southwark Council)	MT
Kelsey Mann	KM	Neal Purvis (Open Comms, Chair)	NP
Maria Palumbo	MP	Neil Kirby (Southwark Council)	NK
Patrick McDermott	PM	Olive Green (Southwark Council)	OG
Paulette Kelly	PK	Sophie Hall-Thompson (Southwark)	SHT

1. Introductions and apologies

- 1.1. Neal took the Chair and invited all participants to introduce themselves.
- 1.2. Apologies were received from Keith Malyon and Cllr Pollak.

2. Minutes of the Estate Project Team meeting of 8 October

- 2.1. The Minutes were accepted as accurate.

3. Preferred Option

- 3.1. Neil apologised for the delay in circulating the officer's recommendation to Cllr Pollak. The officer recommendation is to adopt Option 5 (demolition of all the low rise except Manor Grove, with in-fill housing, a new school and shops and repairs to Council Tenants' homes in Manor Grove). This choice was made to balance the competing views and interests of residents on the estate.
- 3.2. Francis expressed concern that some residents had tried to stop the majority view of residents across the estate. He said Manor Grove should be treated as an integral part of the estate. Andy supported the recommendation for Option 5 to be put to ballot because he thought it is a solution that works for everyone. Andy had spoken to some other residents in Manor Grove who also supported it. Maria thanked Council staff for taking everyone's needs into account.
- 3.3. Neal noted the recommendation should include a reference to replacing the shops.
- 3.4. **ACTION:** add replacement of commercial property in the recommendation (**Neil**).

- 3.5. Assuming Cllr Pollak accepts the recommendation, he will sign an Individual Decision-Making Report (IDM) to take Option 5 forward. The Report will be published on the website and 5 working days allowed for residents to make any comments and representations, followed by another 5 days in which a councillor can request Scrutiny of the decision. The decision on the Offer to Residents for the Yes/No Ballot will be made by Southwark's Cabinet in January 2021.
- 3.6. Andrew asked if 5 working days would be enough for residents to give their comments. Neil felt it would be adequate; the five-day period is a legal requirement, and it would be wrong to extend the process without good reason. Andrew requested Southwark staff are briefed and prepared for the consultation period so they were clear when residents asked questions on the contents of the IDM.
- 3.7. Andrew requested each member say if they wanted to see any changes to the amendment. No one requested any amendments.
- 3.8. Andrew noted that the majority seemed to support the recommendation and that the Group would need to stand by any consequences. He asked how many less new homes would be delivered in Option 5 instead of Option 4? Neil said that as well as 200 replacement homes for existing residents, there would be an estimated 220 additional Council homes and 220 homes for sale or intermediate rent, which will help pay for the redevelopment. The figures may change slightly as the design work progresses.
- 3.9. Juliette asked the financial implications of the recommended option (Option 5) for freeholders and leaseholders, and Neal noted that this would need to be addressed in the draft Landlord Offer.

4. Phasing

- 4.1. Neil said that the council will be able to circulate a paper on phasing when Cllr Pollak has recommended Option 5. The aim of the phasing plan is to ensure as many residents as possible can stay on the estate throughout the work, and that moves can be completed within about 3 years of the start of the work.
- 4.2. The first blocks to be demolished in Phase 1 will be Ullswater and Hillbeck. When new homes have been built on these sites Bowness, Kentmere and Heversham will be demolished in the second phase
- 4.3. The new school will be built after the replacement homes have been completed.
- 4.4. Francis asked when Hillbeck is likely to be decanted. Neil thought that it would probably take place in about 18 months, provided planning permission is granted.
- 4.5. Details of the current version of the phasing plan will be sent out to RPG members at the same time as the Draft Landlord Offer.
- 4.6. **ACTION:** send out draft Landlord Offer and Phasing Plan week beginning 16.11.20. to RPG members (Neil & Sophie)

5. Local Lettings Plan

- 5.1. Mike explained that the Council will also be able to share a draft lettings plan if Cllr Pollak agrees to endorse Option 5. This will be included in the Landlord Offer.
- 5.2. All the replacement properties will be ring-fenced for Tustin residents. The Council has agreed in principle to pre-allocate new homes to individual tenants so that they do not need to bid for a new home. Council staff will update the housing needs survey of residents, including leaseholders, during the planning stage to update its information on household needs and discuss residents' wishes and preferences.
- 5.3. **ACTION:** share details of the draft Lettings scheme with RPG members when Cllr Pollak has made his recommendation (**Mike**)
- 5.4. Andrew noted that residents will need time to consider all the new information.
- 5.5. Amelia asked if leaseholders will be able to afford the new homes. Mike said that approximate valuations of new homes will be shared with residents.

6. Manor Grove residents meeting

- 6.1. Neal noted that minutes of the Manor Grove meeting, which was held on 26 October, were included in the meeting papers. Cllr Pollak had attended the meeting.
- 6.2. Minutes were updated to reflect that Andy C had asked why the TCA had joined the meeting when Manor Grove residents were being denied access to TCA meetings despite being eligible for membership. Andrew Eke had joined the Manor Grove meeting to help a Manor Grove tenant get online. Andrew said that as the TCA Chair he also had a right to attend any meetings that were relevant to the Association's members.
- 6.3. The Minutes of the meeting were noted by the meeting.

7. Design webinar

- 7.1. David reported that only 4 residents had attended the first design webinar. They had discussed shared and public spaces and housing for people aged 55 and older.
- 7.2. On open spaces, residents said play areas should be enclosed and that there should be fitness and exercise equipment available for young people (and possible adults). They thought there should be a separate dog-walking area.
- 7.3. The meeting had also examined the design of a possible block for older residents, including shared and private gardens.
- 7.4. Paulette said she had received two leaflets that day, one saying the meeting was cancelled and another that it was going ahead. She thought this might explain the low turnout. Sophie thought the cancellation leaflet might have referred to a support session on digital skills that had to be cancelled.
- 7.5. Paulette asked if it would be possible to visit over-55 blocks on other developments, and Neal asked whether a virtual tour could be arranged during the COVID-19 restrictions. Sophie said the Council is considering whether to produce a video. She said the Aylesbury over-55 housing was popular with residents. Neal noted this would need planning and organising as soon as possible for residents to get the information needed before the February Ballot..

7.6. **ACTION:** investigate if a virtual tour of Aylesbury over-55 block is possible (**Sophie**)

7.7. Andrew asked how residents would be engaged during the current lockdown. David said the new website is now live, and that it has been designed to enable quick and easy feedback. Sophie said the Council is considering placing a model of Option 5, protected by perspex, at the entrance to the estate so that people can see the preferred option and make comments. Andrew suggested there was space on Engie's hoarding that could also include details on the scheme.

7.8. Andy reported a getting an error message when he tried to log onto the new Tustin website.

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

7.10. Andrew felt more creative solutions are needed to the current problems consulting residents. He was also concerned that subtle changes appear into the design without residents having oversight. For example, some residents over 55 would still want to live in general needs housing rather than separate blocks, and the Manifesto called to "like-for-like" housing. Neil confirmed that older residents (and other residents too) will be able to express their preference for their new housing.

7.11. Amelia asked if there was any information on the types of homes that are being planned. David said there will be a mix of homes which will include maisonettes, flats (some with gardens on the ground or podium levels) and possibly small single-aspect houses around the new school. Providing so many new homes would allow quite a lot of variety and choice. Sophie said the designs will need to be developed further so that details can be included in the Landlord Offer.

7.12. Mike stressed there would still be considerable consultation on design after the ballot in February.

8. Landlord Offer

8.1. Mike confirmed the Draft Offer will be sent to RPG members as soon as the IDM report is drafted, before the decision is made.

9. Resident Engagement Plan

9.1. Mike said the engagement plan now includes Common Grounds' design workshops.

9.2. There will be a design webinar on Sustainability at 6.00 pm on **Monday 16 November**. Sophie said the flyer has been sent out, and that a reminder will be delivered on the day.

9.3. There will also be a workshop on the Health & Equalities Impact and Cost-benefit work on **Wednesday 25 November**.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81921659187?pwd=WDZGdmtEaTNrd2FOYTVUOUZEamE2QT09> Meeting ID: 819 2165 9187 Passcode: 228395

9.4. The procurement workshop, which had been planned for November, will now be rescheduled. Neil stressed the Council wants to involve residents as much as possible in the selection of the development partner. Sophie said Southwark is

considering setting up a Tustin Design Group for residents with a particular interest in the design work.

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

9.6. There will be an estate-wide residents meeting with the Council on **Wednesday 2 December**. Neal suggested paper copies of the design and other information should be sent out to all homes in good time before the online meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81260914537?pwd=Tk9sY0F6NG1BenJObEw2V1Bic1FYUT09> Meeting ID: 812 6091 4537 Passcode: 694050

9.7. The decision to recommend Option 5 will be publicised in the newsletter as soon as the IDM report is completed.

9.8. Andrew asked if any members had concerns about Open Communities contacting residents during the February ballot. No one raised any issues in the meeting, but Mike will be happy to discuss any issues.

10. Matters Arising

10.1. *Manor Grove meeting (3.7):* completed 26.10.20.

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

10.3. *Life-cycle cost queries (6.6):* completed. Neal did not receive any queries.

10.4. *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.

10.5. *Equity loan scheme (8.1):* completed. Neal has sent this information out

11. Any Other Business

11.1. None.

12. Next meeting

12.1. The next meeting will be held at 6.00 p.m. on Thursday 12 November.

The meeting ended at 8.04 p.m.