

## Tustin Estate Project Team Meeting

Thursday, 8 July 2021 by Zoom

### MINUTES

Present	Initials	Present	Initials
Amelia Leeson	AL	Mike Tyrell (LBS)	MT
Andrew Eke (TCA chair)	AE	Modupe Somoye (LBS)	M
Andy Chaggar	AC	Neil Kirby (LBS)	NK
Patrick McDermott	PM	Paul Adams (Pulse Consult)	PA
Paulette Kelly	PK	Sophie Hall-Thompson (LBS)	SHT
Francis Phillip	FP		
Ian Simpson (Open Communities)	IS	Stephen Moore (Open Communities)	SM

#### 1. Introductions and apologies for absence

- 1.1. IS took the Chair and invited all participants to introduce themselves.
- 1.2. Apologies were received from Neal Purvis (Open Communities).

#### 2. Minutes of TEPG meeting 10.06.21

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

#### 2. LBS Update

- 2.1. NK said the report was only finalised on Tuesday afternoon, which is late in the day for a variety of reasons. The first report sets out that the council is committed to the whole scheme as per the Offer Document. That is: 200 council homes, 49 shared equity home, 220 new council homes which will be a mixture of rented and key worker rented homes, the private homes and the school and the park. It commits the council to everything, it's a lot of money – £220 million. It's broadly an announcement to officers to get on with delivering the scheme. The report goes through the leaseholder offer too.
- 2.2. Most of it we have seen before, the key changes are around the finance. We need about £14 million to get to the planning permission stage. The Cabinet meeting is 11am to 1pm Tuesday 13 July.
- 2.3. The second report – in order to start on site in September 2022 we have got to appoint a contractor who can deliver the scheme for us. 220 homes will be for private sale; the private contractor will build the council homes, the school and the park and whole scheme. We are proposing to go through the Pagabo framework, and the report is asking the council for permission to use this framework.
- 2.4. An organisation will be appointed by October/November. Residents will be on the panel appointing the contractor. We have been trying to get people involved all the way through; it is quite different from what we usually do. The next time this goes

to Cabinet will be to appoint the contractor, which will be fantastic. The contractor will bear some of the risk for building and selling the private homes.

- 2.5. PK asked if there will be training sessions to aid the resident involvement in selecting a contractor? NK said he had spoken to Neal Purvis in Open Communities about providing the kind of training that might be needed, including work around the social value aspect of the contract, so residents can decide who will be the right contractor to work with. **ACTION: NK to come to the next RPG with suggestions for training for residents involved in selecting the contractor for the scheme.**
- 2.6. FP is concerned that the contractor does not cut corners. NK said that everyone is aware of the need to ensure that corners are cut. There is a lot more attention on building contracts and the Building Safety Act that is going through Parliament. The prices are going up as a result because people are realising they are more accountable than before. It's a really good point about how are we going to ensure there is quality going through the design of the scheme and, once we are site, how are we going to make sure corners are not being cut?
- 2.7. FP asked for clarity on the numbers of homes proposed. NK said the scheme will provide 200 replacement council homes at council rent, 49 council shared equity homes for leaseholders, 220 extra council homes at council rent and key worker rent, and 220 new homes for private sale.
- 2.8. AE added that the 220 extra council homes takes account of the additional housing need on the estate – it's a 100% increase of homes to cater for everybody who needs one.
- 2.9. AL said developers often have poor reputations. Is this still a tenure-blind development? NK said the developer will build everything and that follows Southwark's planning policy in terms of standards. We need to keep a close eye on it to ensure that no-one cuts corners. It needs to be built to the highest possible standard.  
The mixture of tenures is something that needs to be discussed. Whether that means there is a mixture in every block or not, we don't know at the moment. The priority has to be rehousing people, so there needs to be homes for rent – but we also need the developer to sell some homes to help pay for the scheme, so there will be some for private sale as well.  
What the council would never allow is gated communities or having facilities that only some residents can use. It is about working out how we create one community.
- 2.10. MT said it will be us setting the specification that the contractors will work to. We all know examples where poor-quality materials have been used in the past.
- 2.11. AE said every single qualifying resident on this estate will have a very important role to play. If we want the quality, the residents have got to step up to ensure it. The workshop has been built into the process so we will have the opportunity to feed into that; we cannot just leave them to it. **ACTION: Arrange training for residents on procurement and resident involvement in the process NP**
- 2.12. AL asked what the implications will be for leaseholders of the uncertainty around tenure mix in the early build stages – how can we be sure when we are getting leasehold blocks/properties? NK said this would all be pinned down in the

next six months, before we go for planning permission. The Cabinet approval of the report will give us the authority to start talking to leaseholders about CPOs and their options. What we are waiting for is a developer to come along to feed into the process of when they will be building private sale homes and so on.

- 2.13. AL asked how a leaseholder would get those numbers at the moment? NK said we need to come back on how the Stock Condition Survey will be taken into account with the valuations. We are looking for housing tenure to be integrated throughout the estate. We won't know what that is until we have had those detailed discussions, which will come next as we work through the design.
- 2.14. FP said he thinks mixed tenure blocks bring problems currently. NK said that is part of the discussion we want to start having: Once these are built, how will they be managed? In some areas there are issues but you can design out some of those issues.
- 2.15. AE asked NK what value he would put on a leaseholder being part of this process? NK said we need people to move in as part of the scheme, but are constrained in terms of market values [of leaseholders' current properties]. Those discussions are about talking to people to find out what deal works for them – but they will look at market value. We are not saying the council has lots of money and can agree with whatever people want. But we want to see people staying in the area and remaining part of the neighbourhood, as long as people can afford to continue living there. We will set up a leaseholders' meeting once we have got more information.
- 2.16. PA spotted an error in the report, a reference to "early February 2022" should be "early March 2022".
- 2.17. Picking up on social value, NK said it is part of the key discussions in future, and what are the priorities? Is it about apprenticeships or work experience with the architects, or something else? The architects have all set out what they are prepared to offer.
- 2.18. AE said he had not seen much reference to the Manor Grove major works. NK said it is part of the scheme and the refurbishment of the homes in Manor Grove is detailed in the Cabinet report. It is all part of what the contractor will take on as part of the programme.
- 2.19. AE said he would rather the council let the architects take the lead on the social value aspect of the scheme; we wouldn't allow a prescriptive approach to it, but we require a particular standard. We are talking about the youths and the older people as well – they need to learn digital literacy. We have been helping people as much as we are allowed to during the pandemic restrictions, but a lot of people will need help and support to really engage with this process.
- 2.20. NK said there will be some things that are written into the contract with the contractors, but there are some things that residents are better at negotiating from the contractors, such as working with younger and older people.

### **3b. Resident Engagement Plan**

- 2.21. SHT said we have updated what we are doing in July and highlighting in the Design and Delivery Group that we are trying to make them more reactive and fun on-site, including local site visits on the estate; we have drawn up a list of local places that we would like to go to. On the Tustin Estate we would like to audit the good and bad so that we can try to keep the good bits. Blossom Court is one of the places we are going to visit.
- 2.22. We will be holding events; August is aimed at young people, September at older people. Re: para 3.19, we can try to improve digital literacy in the summer months ahead of the winter. Should we pull together a best practice session sooner or later? MT said in his experience it was better to do this after the first few site visits.
- 2.23. AL said site visits are really useful; is there any way we could also see some internals? SHT said we will have more ideas about places to visit once we have the design teams on board. Coffee mornings with them will also help.

### **3d. Demolition Notice and Right to Buy**

- 2.24. MT said the newsletter explains in simple terms what the Demolition Notice means and is written so as not to get people worried. People are often concerned that they are losing the Right to Buy permanently, but it is only a suspension.

### **3. Report from Design and Delivery Sub Group Meeting 24 June**

- 3.1. IS said there was a visit to Sylvan Grove last month, where they were able to speak to some of the tenants, which people found helpful.
- 3.2. FP said we should be treated the same as private residents who can go inside to see show flats before they buy.
- 3.3. AE said he wanted to see the issues raised during that visit noted down in writing to refer to, so we can keep track. IS said this was happening already, and the Design Issues Log would be added to going forward. MT said he thought residents' likes and dislikes will help encourage debate within the Design and Delivery Group.
- 3.4. SHT said there is a marketing suite at Crimscott Street that can be viewed. We also need to make that information available on the Tustin website.

### **4. Draft newsletter**

- 4.1. MT said there had been a couple of changes to the draft newsletter. He wants to get it distributed first thing in the morning, due to Covid case numbers rising.

### **5. Matters arising from the meeting of 10 June 2021**

- 5.1. (4.6) ACTION: send link for the Cabinet meeting to residents before meeting on 13 July (NP).  
**ACTION: IS to ensure this link has been sent.**
- 5.2. (8.2) ACTION: send minutes to leaseholders with contact details (NP).  
**Completed.**
- 5.3. (10.5) ACTION: give progress report to the July RSG meeting (Pulse Consult).  
**Completed.**
- 5.4. (12.1.1) ACTION: Demolition notice and Right to Buy (paragraph 3.16) - Neil still needs details from the Home Ownership team. NK to update the July meeting.  
**Completed.**
- 5.5. (12.1.3) ACTION: Three Towers RPG meeting (6.4) – NP to send Sophie an invitation.  
**Completed.**
- 5.6. (12.1.4) ACTION: Feasibility Study timetable (6.9) – NK to send out updated version.  
**ACTION: IS to chase up.**
- 5.7. (12.1.5) ACTION: Manor Grove Structural Engineer Report (6.15) – Hunters have sent a draft report, but it does not yet contain costs. SHT to send out to residents when available.  
**ACTION: SHT to send completed report tomorrow.**
- 5.8. (13.1) ACTION: AC to send details of youth charity providing a work programme for 16- to 18-year-olds to Neil Kirby, who will circulate it to the Local Economy team.  
**Completed.**

## 6. Any Other Business

- 6.1. AE said that in the Design Group, people are talking about the buildings but not things like parking, for example. We need things like the commitment to return the parking as the building work progresses, so it needs to be included in the planning. Building work also attracts a lot of fly-tipping, so we need to make sure there are measures in place to stop that. People in Kentmere are suffering a lot from this, and behind the school. I would like to mitigate these things before they occur.  
IS said these issues are usually included in a disruption minimisation plan, but they could be included in discussions before then.
- 6.2. FP asked if night-vision CCTV could be installed in blind spot areas so that fly-tippers can be fined whether they do it day or night.

## 7. Date of next meeting – 12 August 2021

ENDS