

**Minutes of Ledbury Estate Residents Project Group Meeting
1st May 2018**

Attendance:

RPG Members

Sue Slaughter	SS	Resident	Val Taylor	VT	Resident
Thomas Ennis	TE	Resident	Glenn Holmes	JD	Resident
Patrick Goode	PG	Resident	Serife Dervish	SD	Resident

Jeanette Mason JM TRA Chair

Mike Tyrrell	MT	LBS	Ferenc Morath	FM	LBS
Abigail Buckingham	AB	LBS	Sharon Shadbolt	SSh	LBS

Mark Baines MB Hunters Graham Acus GA Hunters

Neal Purvis NP Open Communities - ITLA
Lockhart Murdoch LM Open Communities

Apologies for Absence Joanna David, Shelene Byers

1. Introductions

NP welcomed guests from Hunters and round the table intros conducted for their benefit.

2. Notes of the Meeting 10 April 2018

Agreed subject to typo corrections around 3.7 - 3.10

3. Options Appraisal (OA)

3.1 AB outlined the procurement process which had resulted in the appointment of Hunters as OA consultants. SD asked for example questions which were asked of tenders during the process. AB explained further.

3.2 The appraisal was expected to cover

- A general description of the options
- Diagrammatic drawings
- Overall assessment of each option to include pros and cons
- Assessment of the impact and consequences to the council
- Assessment of the impact and consequences to residents, the local community and other community groups
- Financial and sustainability assessment of each option using the council's agreed model
- Planning permissions including any requirements for environmental impact
- Sustainability considerations
- Value management
- Whole life costs with an estimate assessment of costs
- Time frames, phasing options and key mile stones
- Risks

- Potential legal issues
- Technical constraints
- Indicative 3D Massing studies
- Indicative parking proposals
- Indicative amenity space calculations
- Density calculations
- Mix and tenure plans including unit sizes and floor levels
- Layer plans indicating mix and tenure locations
- Identification of local priorities that could be met and delivered alongside the development

The timetable and delivery was anticipated to be:

Initial Meeting with LBS and formal appointment	24 April
Initial RPG meeting	1 May
Training Workshop RPG	May
Options appraisal work / Consider format for wider presentation/ 1 st Options draft to RPG	May - July
Resident Consultation	July / August
Presentation of Final Options Report to client / RPG	August
Cabinet Report	September / October

3.3 Hunters - Mark and Graham of Hunters introduced themselves. Advised they felt they had been given a very open brief to look at all possible aspects of the Ledbury Major Works scheme including looking at options, costs, opportunities, landscaping, infill etc. The first phase of work will be a fact finding exercise gathering information and carrying out site visits.

3.4 Hunters were not structural engineers and did not have wide experience of Large Panel Systems. Hunters had access to ARUP reports and their brief did not extend to revisiting structural issues. Hunters understood structural strengthening was feasible and this meant refurbishment was a legitimate option.

3.5 Hunters would examine options from a design point of view and this would include looking at better use of space, the ability to move around the estate, landscaping, signage, security, re-providing all units in case of demolition plus extra units. Hunters understood costing of refurbishment options had already been done and will look at combining this with infill development.

3.6 The workshop for the RPG with Hunters will include an outline of the criteria used to compare different options.

3.7 Hunters will look at the 4 refurbishment options and make suggestions on how to whittle down these options as the process progresses.

3.8 TE wanted to exercise to also consider underfloor heating as an alternative to a district boiler.

3.9 JM questioned the effect of the Options Appraisal on the rest of the estate and did not want to see major changes to the low rise maisonettes.

3.10 There was a discussion on the “red lines” of the Option Appraisal and what should be included and excluded.

3.11 GH suggested continuous changes to Building Regulations were occurring week by week and this must impact on the council’s view of LPS blocks. AB responded that the council had anticipated changes to the Building Regulations and had allowed sufficient

costs in the refurbishment option to deal with this, for example an allowance for sprinkler systems to be retro fitted.

3.12 FM confirmed the council would be faced with far reaching decisions in relation to such changes. In terms of the Asset Management approach, the four blocks would not be considered in isolation. Their history and the effect on the whole estate would need to be considered.

3.13 In response to a question from GH, FM confirmed that the Council will provide all source information used as part of the Option Appraisal to the RPG, subject to data protection regulations and the need to protect commercial confidentiality. GH welcomed this.

3.14 PG suggested many design issues would arise such as sight lines, colours etc. NP suggested such detailed discussion was further down the line.

3.15 Hunters and NP would liaise over future meetings which will include Hunters attendance at each monthly RPG plus the initial workshop and other issues relating to wider consultation to be arranged.

3.16 Hunters will produce a report that is presented to the RPG and the Council that takes account of technical issues, costs and residents views. The Council will then prepare a Cabinet Report recommending an option for the Councillors on the Cabinet to make a decision on the future of the estate. If this involved demolition, there would need to a tenant ballot later in the process before any planning application.

3.17 MT presented a paper on Consultation in the light of the recently issued GLA Good Practice Guide on Housing and Regeneration. The guidance suggested consultation should extend beyond the four tall blocks, as what happened to them would inevitably have an affect on neighbouring blocks. This issue would get further attention when the "red line" question was settled. GLA Guidance also recommended ballots be held.

3.18 TE questioned the matter of Votes on proposals and suggested different groups had different interests - e.g. resident and non resident leaseholders, tenants with a right to return, tenants still in situ etc. FM stated LB Southwark would pay heed to these factors when any vote took place.

4. Update from LBS

4.1 Sylvan Grove - MT gave an update on offers and acceptances, which were progressing well. This week would see viewing of 1 and 3 beds on floors 1 - 4, next week 2 beds. Higher floor viewings would follow. There were 18 x 2 beds and 18 applicants for 2 beds however there were 17 different designs of 2 beds. Open days were continuing. All floors viewing should be complete by 23rd May. No tenancy agreements had yet been signed for legal reasons relating to Planning and change of tenures, e.g. from shared ownership to Council rented etc.

4.2 MT advised tenant satisfaction was high on the viewing open days that he and other local officers in the team felt very rewarded.

4.3 The Deep Clean was continuing with Keepmoat due to follow the Borough Deep Clean team in giving special attention to floors.

4.4 Management of blocks with increasing numbers of voids presented special challenges and the local team were aware of this and exploring a range of initiatives.

5. Resident Issues

5.1 SD raised issue of leaseholder buy back offers and was concerned valuations were now taking account of a perceived downturn in the local property market. Will valuations be

reconsidered in October at the time of the council decision on Ledbury's future? NP and FM will check back on Cabinet decision but in the case of a Right to Buy example, the valuation remained as it was on the date it was carried out.

6. Council Decisions

6.1 LBS shared equity offer was still to be finalized. More information is in preparation along with a Cabinet Report for decision in June.

6.2 Right to Succession for any leaseholders who move to Sylvan Grove will be spelt out in the information the Council provide.

6.3 MT reported that 17 leaseholders had requested valuations, of those 2 leaseholders had agreed a price for the voluntary buyback, and there were 5 leaseholders awaiting a valuation.

7. Matters Arising

7.1 (3.12) Door Entries Security is still a problem. MT advised fixing 20 year old systems was proving difficult as LBS did not want to spend significant sums on the door entries until the future of the blocks was decided.

7.2 (6.1) Maydew House Report circulated, (6.2) MT paper on consultation, and (6.12) FRA Actions update reported to RPG -All completed.

8. AOB

8.1 Residents raised issues of temporary rehousing if refurbishment option is chosen. MT confirmed this is under consideration and he had circulated a paper on this. It was very unlikely all 4 blocks would be done at the same time.

8.2 Workshop with Hunters - NP to circulate a date

9. Date of next Meeting

5th June at 7.00pm