

Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting

Thursday, 13 May 2021 by Zoom

| Present | Initials | Present | Initials |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|----------|
| Amelia Leeson (Bowness) | AL | Andrew Johnson (LBS) | AJ |
| Andy Chaggar (Manor Grove) | AC | Catherine Brownell (LBS) | CB |
| Patrick McDermott (Manor Grove) | PM | Hema Vashi (LBS) | HV |
| Paulette Kelly (TCA) (Kentmere) | PK | Modupe Somoye (LBS) | MS |
| Jonas (Manor Grove) | J | Mike Tyrell (LBS) | MT |
| 'OnePlus' | O | Neil Kirby (LBS) | NK |
| | | Sharon Burrell (LBS) | SB |
| | | Sadbat Ibn-Ibrahim | SI |
| 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 Maria Palumbo and Jess Horwell Andrew Eke, Sophie Hall-Thompson (LBS) and Olive Green (LBS).

2. Minutes of TEPG meeting 8.4.21

- 2.1 The Minutes were agreed as an accurate record – **ACTION: NP will amend the paragraph numbering as appropriate (NP).**

3. LBS Update

3a. Resident Engagement Plan

- 3.1 MT said the plan is very similar to the one we have seen previously. In the next two months, work planned for June is reviewing the final Design Brief to ensure we have the right details in there, and the resident-led review to shortlist the Design Team. LBS is also reviewing the Procurement Strategy for the main contractor, and the draft Cabinet Report which NK will bring to the next meeting.
- 3.2 There will be a leaseholder meeting on 3 June, and an estate-wide meeting on the Rehousing Process. We are still finalising the details of the Rehousing Strategy Report and once we have it we will have an estate-wide meeting on that. After 21 June, LBS also hope to be able to restart the coffee mornings once the Covid restrictions are lifted.
- 3.3 AC repeated his previous request that Manor Grove residents be invited to both the TRA and the RPG meetings, as there are differences between them. If we're not going to get invited, some of us are concerned we'll be missing out on some important details. AC also volunteered to take part in the interview process for the architects in June. NP

added it would be helpful for the RPG to have reasonable notice of these meeting dates so residents have time to organise themselves.

3.4 NP asked if the estate-wide meeting is expected to take place online or will be held back until people can meet together in the same space. MT said if it's after 21 June it can be in public – but is keen to organise a hybrid meeting as many residents have said they benefit from joining virtually due to childcare and similar commitments.

3b. Draft Procurement Strategy for Main Contractor

3.5 NK said the assumption is that one contractor/developer will come in and build everything on the estate, including the school, landscaping, infrastructure, both private sale and council homes, and refurbishment of Manor Grove. LBS are looking to use a framework, which means the candidates have already been tested in terms of finance, they satisfy certain criteria, they've been through the advertising process – so it's a lot quicker to get them involved.

3.6 We're looking at using a contractor framework called PAGOBO, and talking to them about how quickly we can get going. Like with the architects, we are very keen to get residents from the RPG and TCA involved with that appointment, which will include an interview process, and SHT will be working up a timescale for this.

3.7 NP said the contracts themselves will be unwieldy for residents – what would be helpful is a document that sets out the main elements of the relationship between the council and the contractor, and what the contract covers. NK agreed and said a new programme manager/consultant, once recruited, will be able to set this out clearly. **ACTION:** *Overview document of framework contract to be produced for next RPG (NK).*

3.8 AL asked about the selection process for the developer – is it similar to the way we chose the architects (a shortlist of three were interviewed)? NK said the shortlist is 5 or 6 people and the council would whittle it down to 2 or 3 who would then be subject to that selection process with residents. The earliest we could get the contractor appointed would be the autumn. We can set out the process and the new consultant will help us put that together in a sensible way.

3c. Local Lettings and Rehousing Strategy

3.9 MT said the strategy will be ready next month. LBS are still working out how we will facilitate residents (tenants and leaseholders) who undertake two moves – there are costs and equalities issues to be finalised.

3.10 LBS are getting on with the beginning of the process to move residents from Hillbeck. MT thanked the TCA for their help getting residents who are not IT literate, and/or don't have their own computer, to register on the Housing List.

3d. Draft Cabinet Report

- 3.11 NK said the report still needs to be drafted. It will set out how we take the project forward, in terms of procurement, contractors, and how we are going to pay for it. The whole scheme will cost about £290million.
- 3.12 The Greater London Authority (GLA) has changed the way its grant scheme works and a couple of months ago we realised we had to apply immediately for funding for the replacement of council homes. LBS submitted a bid and got the money, but it is dependent on us being on site and starting demolition by September 2022.
- 3.13 Some of the other funding we need is already in place. LBS have already submitted a bid to the GLA for funding for some of the additional council homes.
- 3.14 LBS have started the procurement of the Design Team, started the recruitment of the Independent Tenants' and Residents' Advisor (tenders are due in imminently), we have appointed the Programme Manager who will be a really useful resource, and the Equalities and Health Consultant, and started the process of appointing a contractor, as above.
- 3.15 The Cabinet Report will update on where we are, what's been going on in the background, update on where we are with money (including money for the school), and agree the Local Lettings Policy (to honour what's in the Offer Document and make it better than for previous schemes). It will also cover the Demolition Notice, which stops Right To Buy while the project gets underway, keeping the number of leaseholders at the current level. It allows us to quantify how much money we need to complete the scheme. It stays effective for up to seven years and applies to all affected blocks (e.g. not the towers, not the freeholder properties in Manor Grove – but it would apply to the council-owned properties in Manor Grove). The Demolition Notice is standard practice for schemes like this. There is a link in the document to more information online.
- 3.16 NP said that tenants will not have seen the Demolition Notice before; it affects them because they cannot exercise Right To Buy. Do you also serve it to leaseholders in the affected blocks (Heversham, Hillbeck, Kentmere and Bowness), or just to the tenants? It is important that it is clear and it needs to be discussed at the leaseholders' meeting as well as at the estate-wide meeting. Leaseholders will be concerned about the effect of the notice on their ability to sell, and the effect on the sale value of their property.
Action: NK to clarify whether leaseholders in the affected blocks are also served the Demolition Notice, and what happens with RTB applications that are mid-way through being processed. (NK)
- 3.17 MT said he would run an article in the Estate Newsletter explaining the Demolition Notice before they are issued to residents.
- 3.18 HV said that the Demolition Notice is a blanket notice and there are two of them: the first notifies of the intention to demolish, and a final notice is served 12 months prior to demolition taking place.
- 3.19 AL asked how RTB affects leaseholders' properties. NP said it doesn't affect leaseholders, but anxieties might be raised among some leaseholders when they receive it as it says the council intends to demolish their block. The questions will be 'when?' and 'what impact does this have on me?' and the council needs clarity on the answers before the leaseholders meeting.

- 3.20 AL asked if it effectively means the only market open to leaseholders wanting to sell is to sell back to the council? NP said he is raising this now to ensure the council is prepared with clear answers before it puts the Demolition Notice in the public domain. The law says that if the council is buying your home from you, the property's value is pegged to the point in time before the council started talking about demolition (e.g. full market value). But people will need clarity on that from the council as they will no doubt be concerned.
- 3.21 NP said it would be helpful for the RPG to see the Cabinet Report as it develops. NK said this will happen.

3e. Draft Social Value Strategy

- 3.22 NK said the council will always aim to get the maximum amount of social value from the contracts for the benefit of residents, including the school. There is a limited number of residents on Tustin and therefore a limit to what you can do. The question has been how we link Tustin into all the work going on in the wider Old Kent Road area, including employment and apprenticeships. We are looking at construction training, with a centre that's moving to Canada Water imminently, business support, links to colleges and universities. LBS will be looking at who will be offering that social value, where does it go, how do you link it to individuals. We are looking at developing schools programmes. LBS don't want it to be a box-ticking exercise for each contractor; they want it to mean something.
- 3.23 The first priority will be for residents of Tustin, after that maybe looking at the ward, or the wider Old Kent Road area. But that needs to be developed further. LBS are happy to have a discussion about what to ask for, in the next couple of months. The TCA has some experience in this area with Engie and we want to build on that.
- 3.24 NP asked what stage is the Old Kent Road Social Regeneration Charter at, and how can residents see the details? If the Tustin strategy has to fit into the work that's already been done on this, they need to understand what that framework is. NK said this was agreed by the council's cabinet about 18 months ago and should be on the council website and the Old Kent Road website as well. It pulls together information about the population, its health needs, and so on, and agrees a series of priorities moving forward. Since then, Covid has arrived and highlighted different gaps and needs in the community; we want to ensure that is reflected in the work we are doing on Tustin.
Action: NK to forward the link to NP. The link is here [Regeneration that works for all - Southwark Council](#)
- 3.25 NP said there is not much information in the strategy's "Residents Group: Residents and Businesses" column. This is an area that needs more focus so it's clear how it relates to the lives of residents on the estate. NK agreed and said LBS welcome any comments. Some of it links to discussions we have had about ensuring the Tustin website is more locally owned. NP suggested this should be revisited every few months. NK said the council is looking for formalise this over the next couple of months before these long-term partnerships with contractors are entered into.

4 Report from Design and Delivery Sub-Group Meeting, 7 April

4.1 The Minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record then moves onto the Matters Arising:

4.2 2.4: NP and IS to develop a draft training programme

NP has set a date for the first training session for 19 May. One of the things we'll be discussing will be other training people would like in order to have the most influence, so gather ideas on what else needs to follow.

4.3 3.7 SHT to send draft invitation to tender to participants for comment

NP said the invite was circulated after the meeting and again with the papers for this meeting, and there is a deadline noted in there. He asked CB to provide an overview of the invitation and what happens next.

4.4 CB said the document is both a summary design brief and the invitation to tender brief.

The first gives prospective architects enough information for them to understand the project, and the second half is the steps we will undertake to select an architect and award the contract, along with how we are going to be evaluating them. They will be expected to move on from the masterplan with some healthy but efficient interrogation and testing of that, as we're on a tight timescale. The second half is how we evaluate that, and there is some information for residents about the evaluation process – what we are looking for from the architects.

4.5 AC raised a point about Para 5.25 (p15) of the Brief re: community engagement with residents. Referring back to comments he made earlier re: access for Manor Grove residents to the TCA meetings, if that situation isn't resolved, can a bullet point be added here to say there may be a need for an occasional meeting with Manor Grove residents as well? **ACTION: CB and NK agreed to make that amendment.**

4.6 NP asked about timescales and what happens next? CB said we need to finalise the document and issue it to the prospective architects on 24 May. NP asked when final comments from residents could be incorporated into the report. NK said they would need them by early week beginning 17.5.21.

5 Draft newsletter

5.1 MT said feedback from NP after a gazebo engagement session on the estate was that there is still some confusion about the result of the Ballot among residents. So the newsletter reiterates the result twice, both on the front and inside page.

5.2 The newsletter also includes an appeal for people to sign up to the Design Sub-Group, with wording drafted by NP. The third article is a roadmap for dealing with the repairs backlog on the estate. The fourth is the return of the coffee mornings.

5.3 PK said the article on the Design Sub-Group needs to emphasise that it's not a closed group, and reflected on the difficulty of getting people on board – and getting those who attended the first meeting to return. AL said the promise of training might draw people in as well, helping them understand the terms that are discussed. NP suggested the advert for people to attend and get training should be placed in the middle of the article. The training takes place on 19 May.

6 Matters arising from the meeting of 8 April

6.1 1.10 **ACTION:** *TCA to consider who is invited to their meetings (TCA).*

NP said he and MT will raise this with Andrew Eke, TCA chair, as there has not been a response yet.

6.2 1.21 **ACTION:** *NK to check minutes of October and November RPG meetings regarding re-procurement of the contract for the independent homeowners' and tenants' advisor.*

As NK said this evening, this is complete – the deadline for submissions is midnight tomorrow.

6.3 1.29 **ACTION:** *NK to bring summary of lessons learnt to next RPG meeting.*

NK said we want to bring the new programme manager along to the next RPG as they are critical to the whole process and keeping us on track with the September deadline. Following the RPG there have been internal discussions and we now have an approach that maximises continuity: retaining some of the consultants we have been using where possible (e.g. on equalities), and re-tendering other contracts due to their value. The council is having quite an open discussion, looking back on contractors including the Design Team and asking what else residents would want to get from the next contract, and from the consultant, etc. It's really helpful to talk about how well Common Grounds talked about things like single and double-aspect homes – how was it done? Is there a better way of doing it? – and what did people think of the way the exhibitions took place? We haven't had that discussion yet, but it would be really useful.

NP asked whether he wanted to have this discussion at the next RPG or somewhere else? NK said it just needs to be done before the new Design Team is on board in July/August – the next RPG will be busy already with the Cabinet Report which includes the Local Lettings Policy.

6.4 1.40 **ACTION:** *AE to invite SHT to the next Three Towers RPG to discuss.*

ACTION: NP will send SHT an invitation to the next Towers RPG meeting, next week, as she may not have been able to attend the previous one.

6.5 1.48 **ACTION:** *NP said he would pick this up along with other detailed comments and circulate them among other RPG members.*

Completed.

6.6 1.49 **ACTION:** *SHT agreed to include mention of the draft Local Lettings Strategy in the next Estate Newsletter.*

MT will do this, once it is agreed.

6.7 1.50 **ACTION:** *SHT agreed to bring an updated version of the Local Lettings Policy to the next RPG meeting for comment.*

NK said he wants to use the Cabinet Report to flag up everything that will be in the Local Lettings Strategy. The detail will be signed off after that point. We originally wanted to take the Lettings Strategy to Cllr Cryan for sign-off in May but because we haven't presented a final version to the RPG yet, we can't do that. As we're running towards July, Cabinet will formally agree the main changes and the detail will come in a separate report to Cllr Cryan for him to sign.

6.8 1.52 **ACTION:** *SHT to revise the Design Brief to make it easier to understand.*

Completed.

6.9 1.53 **ACTION: SHT** agreed to create a summary of updates and how/where Common Grounds' Feasibility Study goes beyond the Landlord Offer Document, to accompany the substantial Feasibility Study itself.

No update at the moment; SHT has been looking at it with Common Grounds. **ACTION: NK** said a timetable would be circulated on when the summary document will be available.

6.10 3.1 **ACTION:** An updated version of the draft residents' newsletter will be shared by SHT or OG tomorrow for comment.
Completed.

6.11 4.2 **ACTION:** Re: Good practice. Once agreed, NK to explain to RPG where and how the lessons learned from good work on the Towers project are going to be used, including monitoring.

NK said we have started that discussion with Sylvester Hylton, who is pulling together a document. Towers residents would probably like to see that as well. NK doesn't have a timescale for that yet. NP said he would also distribute it, once completed, to the Towers RPG as well as this RPG.

6.12 4.4 **ACTION:** NP suggests mention is included in the next newsletter that there is one month left to contribute to the consultation on the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan – and where sub-group 4 is in the document (**Mike Tyrell**).

NP said the deadline for feedback on the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan has just passed, but the council's planners have said they would look at comments received after that date. The sub-group area that includes Tustin is towards the back of the document. If any residents are interested in the plan, he is happy to help them focus on the most important bits.

6.13 4.6 **ACTION: NK** said there is no current council policy on council rents for decanted leaseholders. 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.

NK said this is being finalised as part of the Local Lettings Strategy. By the time of the Leaseholders' meeting this will have been agreed internally so we can explain it clearly.

6.14 4.9 **ACTION:** [8.6 Social value – co-ordination of work between major works contractor working on Tustin Towers and the Regeneration proposals.] - Still no reply received from Engie (**NK**).

NK understands Andrew Eke, TCA chair, has made progress but the two of them need to catch up. NK has also raised it as a strategic issue with the person responsible for social value at Engie. It comes down to monitoring that they do what they have promised. NP added that the lesson from the Towers was making sure that the foundations for this work are laid early on, so that residents can get the greatest benefit from it.

6.15 5.1 **ACTION:** Re: final reports on trial pit surveys in Manor Grove, **SHT** to provide date by email once confirmed.

ACTION: NK to check with SHT – he thinks final reports have been received and can be shared.

NP said Manor Grove and perhaps Kentmere residents will need to be notified; maybe Manor Grove residents will need a specific meeting to understand exactly what it means

for them. It could affect some of them living in the high numbers at Manor Grove significantly.

6.16 5.2 **ACTION:** *Re: learning lessons, ensure residents are given plenty of notice to allow re-letting garages in Manor Grove. NK will pick this up with the Garages Team.*
SHT is chasing the Garages Team on this for a full response.

6.17 NP noted that Matters Arising are growing rather than reducing – it would be good to get some cleared up before the next RPG meeting. NK said the new Programme Manager will help with this, tracking issues better and ensuring more than one officer knows where we are at with a particular issue.

7 Any Other Business

7.1 No other business was raised.

8 Date of next RPG meeting – 10 June 2021

- 19 May 2021 ——— Design and Delivery Sub Group Training
- 27 May 2021 ——— Design and Delivery Sub Group
- 3 June 2021 ——— Leaseholders Meeting
- 10 June 2021 Tustin Estate Project Group Meeting

Stephen Moore 17.5.21.