

**Meeting of Ledbury Estate RPG with Cllr. S Cryan  
3<sup>rd</sup> October 2018**

**1.0 Attendance**

RPG Members

Sue Slaughter SS    Thomas Ennis TE    Jeanette Mason JM  
Shelene Byer SB    Eileen Bassom EB    Alex Hedge AH

Observer

Amy Ziegler AZ

LBS

Cllr Stephanie Cryan    SC    Mike Tyrrell    MT

Open Communities - ITLA

Neal Purvis NP    Lockhart Murdoch LM

Apologies for Absence    Val Taylor, Glenn Holmes, Patrick Goode, Toby Bull

**2.0 Introductions**

NP welcomed all members and Cllr. Stephanie Cryan, LB Southwark Cabinet member for Housing who had come to meet RPG members to discuss the forthcoming Cabinet Report and seek residents' opinions and ideas on the future of the estate.

**3. Cabinet Report**

3.1 SC advised that Version 12 of the report had been circulated but she expected several more versions to be circulated before the final report which MT / NP would ensure are circulated to RPG members. SC advised she fully expected and would welcome a deputation from the estate at Cabinet.

3.2 MT confirmed ARUP continued involvement and referred to paragraph 34 of the report. As Bromyard was a "stand alone" block and there were only 3 tenants remaining, this would most likely be the first block and ARUP would be involved in specifying the works needed there straight away.

3.3 NP advised there would be 2 RPG meetings between now and Cabinet and members would have the chance to thoroughly review the report before Cabinet.

3.3 TE sought assurance that the Cabinet Report would support the full involvement of ARUP in the future refurbishment and noted that, once a block had been stripped back, more issues might be revealed. These would have to be taken on board. MT agreed that ARUP would be involved in specifying and testing the works.

3.4 NP suggested RPG had discussed issues up to Para 29 and should consider from 30 - 37. TE pointed out para 32 stated no new build proposed for the site of the TRA Hall in this phase and sought clarification. Any new build or build on top on the remainder of the estate was excluded from the report.

3.5 Para 35 confirmed the role of Calford Seaden (CS) in the project. Their previous role was confined to cost consultant. In this context CE were part of the council's framework contract and using CE would obviate the need to go through lengthy procurement (including OJEU regs).

3.6 SS advised the group has heard of Keepmoat / Engie having a poor track record and history of bad experience. NP advised that their track record was mixed and some estate resident groups had positive experiences with Keepmoat. Once any contract was signed, the Council have a system of checks and balances to keep Engie on track and performing satisfactorily. This included RPG scrutiny of Engie performance via monthly meetings with Contractors and involvement of OC in Contractor Progress meetings. There would be requirements to have Resident Liaison Officers and Clerk of Works on site. SB gave her experience of leaving keys for works in her flat that had not been finished to a high standard.

3.7 When works commence, there would be works to pilot properties which would be inspected at each stage. SG suggested residents could be involved in this and LBS could consider training up a group of local residents to take part in inspections. TE emphasized residents must be satisfied with the standard of internal works.

3.8 The meeting moved on to consider paras 38 - 44. It was suggested that para 48 note that the RPG covers all of the estate.

3.9 Info on Right to Return should be expanded - perhaps by addition of an appendix

3.10 RPG wanted to the report to be more specific on dates and deadlines. SC recognized and shared this desire but due to so many variables it was not possible at tis stage.

3.11 JM raised concerns that residents in some low rise blocks had missed out on works in the past including electrical rewires. RPG suggested that the levels of disruption to the low rise was not covered in the report. For properties adjacent to the towers this was likely to be significant. Low rise part of the estate was not due to be included for major works until 8 years from now. This meant that the estate would suffer all the disruption, dust and noise of the current works for at least 2 -3 years with no benefit to them and then just a few years down the line face disruption again. Cllr Cryan agreed to look at the practicality of bringing low rise works forward in the programme.

3.12 SC explained her responsibility was for Ledbury Estate and to put right the problems with the Towers. SC's Cabinet colleague, Councillor Leo Pollak is responsible for new homes delivery and she will ask him to attend some of the future meetings with Ledbury Residents.

3.13 SC outlined that the RPG would be involved in developing the proposals for the works to the towers, and the design of the new build infill homes. The RPG would also meet regularly with the Council's Clerk of Works, the contractor working on the towers, and the Council's contract manager for the works to monitor the standard, quality, and progress of work.

#### **4. Next Stages post Cabinet**

4.1 An open public meeting for the whole estate should be called post the Cabinet decision.

4.2 Thought should be given to inform non estate residents (e.g. Commercial Way) of proposals as they will be affected in numerous ways. The school should be informed and involved.

4.3 Residents should be involved with the architects in considering the new homes designs.

4.4 Weekly newsletter will be provided to both towers residents, former residents and low rise residents.

#### **5 Any Other Business**

5.1 SC expressed thanks to all RPG members and other residents for their contribution to the whole process. SC had been very impressed with levels of commitment and the council had certainly benefitted considerably from resident involvement.

5.2 JM expressed residents thanks to MT who, as Estate Director, had contributed significantly to the whole process. JM advised the TRA strongly felt it had been working with the council rather than against it as in the past.

5.3 TE advised that leaseholders had been impressed by the speed of response from the council, especially for example in resolving the heating and hot water problems swiftly. TE also felt the levels of consultation had been impressive. Agreement to Leaseholders Right to Return was very gratifying and reassuring.

5.4 SB noted the positive contribution of Open Communities

#### **6.0 Next Meeting**

4.1 NP to organize Cabinet Deputation from next meeting on 9/10/18

L Murdoch 5/10/18