

**Resident Engagement Panel**  
**Review of Options – 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015**

**Attendees:**

Jonathan Croucher – chair  
 Karen Bennett  
 Lucy Pyne  
 Andrea Rose  
 Pauline Porteous-Harley  
 Nicola Curtis  
 Christine Searle – in place of Glen  
 Su Gomer – LBL  
 Hamant Bharadia - LBL  
 Jim Martin – Independent Surveyor  
 Abraham Nomafo - PPCR  
 Ron Houston - PPCR  
 Neil Vokes – LBL  
 Brendan Kilpatrick – PRP architects  
 Cllr Matthew Bennett  
 Fiona Cliffe – LBL  
 Felix Shaw – Local Dialogue

**Apologies:**

Cllr Braithwaite  
 Tayo Richards

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions &amp; Purpose of the Meeting</b>	
	<p>Introductions were given &amp; FC outlined the purpose and format of the meeting.          LBL apologised for not having the viability information for the development options. At this point in time further work needed to be carried out to the financial position in relation to the delivery of the tenures that could be delivered.          FC said the information should be available for the first meeting of the year – 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016.          Residents voiced their frustration (and anger) that the information was still not available.</p>	FC
<b>2</b>	<b>Refurbishment of Central Hill</b>	
	<p>The investment costs for CH were calculated at £18.5 mil – based on information from the SCS &amp; other investment information LBL had.          JM had been brought in as an independent adviser to review the</p>	

	<p>investment costs – a report of his findings was circulated to residents. (Within the report there were comments from LBL’s Quantity Surveyor – these show the differing views; although the conclusions were very similar).</p> <p>JM summarised his findings within the report, specifically in relation to costs.</p> <p>Overall he was satisfied that LBL had considered all the points he had raised.</p> <p>In summary Lambeth had taken a reasonable approach to costs – but there was not major contingency within these and they were based on today’s prices.</p> <p>Inflation would be compounded over the period.</p> <p>JM thought that costs were reasonable &amp; fair – although JM thought these were not excessive.</p> <p>JM said he was willing for anybody to approach him with questions</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Investment Programme</b>	
	<p>SG explained about the investment position.</p> <p>The LHS standard had been based on a 8% sample survey. In 2012 this showed there was a need for £490mil to deliver this.</p> <p>Also identified was a £56 million funding gap.</p> <p>Additional surveys were showing that this gap was increasing – LBL were looking for 100% surveys.</p>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Position of the HRA</b>	
	<p>HB explained that the HRA funds the capital/investment programme.</p> <p>He explained the position of the HRA and that income from the 24,000 homes Lambeth owned was considered across all stock, the account was not run on an estate by estate basis.</p> <p>It was requested that a paper on this information be given out.</p> <p>LBL is reviewing its business plan in the New Year and this would determine what was needed at what could be afforded.</p> <p>There are a number of changes being made to the HRA that were not currently allowed for e.g. rent reduction, the sale of high value voids. etc.</p> <p>VH asked whether the loss of rental income for CH had been assessed in these calculations.</p> <p>HB said there was a loss of income, but also LBL would not be liable for management &amp; maintenance, etc.</p> <p>JC said he felt most residents wanted their homes re-furbished, &amp; LBL have said they couldn’t do this. Is this the case?</p> <p>HB explained the position of the investment gap across the whole of the borough.</p> <p>MB said that the REP could be given the paper in relation to how every ‘£1’ is spent.</p> <p>NC said that a key problem was that repairs to the estate had not been carried out, or hadn’t been done in a cost effective way – e.g. the costs they have for the roof repairs and patching.</p>	<p>Given 14/12</p>

	<p>It was asked why Central Hill had been chosen for regeneration. NV said this was detailed in the original Cabinet Report:</p> <p><u>22<sup>nd</sup> October 2012 Cabinet gives principles for regeneration.</u></p> <p><a href="http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s50180/06%20Estate%20Regen%20Final_22%2010%2012_NV.pdf">http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s50180/06%20Estate%20Regen%20Final_22%2010%2012_NV.pdf</a></p> <p><u>8<sup>th</sup> December 2014 Cabinet - inclusion of Central Hill</u></p> <p><a href="http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s70441/03_Lambeth%20Estate%20Regeneration%20and%20Housing%20Delivery%20-%20December%202014%20v3%20docx.pdf">http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s70441/03_Lambeth%20Estate%20Regeneration%20and%20Housing%20Delivery%20-%20December%202014%20v3%20docx.pdf</a></p> <p><u>27<sup>th</sup> July 2015 Cabinet – up-date on schemes</u></p> <p><a href="http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s76078/Cabinet%20Report%20-%20Estate%20Regeneration%20Update%20-%20July%202015%20v8.pdf">http://moderngov.lambeth.gov.uk/documents/s76078/Cabinet%20Report%20-%20Estate%20Regeneration%20Update%20-%20July%202015%20v8.pdf</a></p> <p><u>Appendix D - Central Hill excerpt:</u></p> <p><i>'The Estate was included in the estates regeneration programme in December 2014. Reasons for inclusion of the Estate in the programme include the poor state of repair of many properties on the Estate and the opportunity to build more homes, due to the relative low density of the Estate, given its location and public transport accessibility levels'.</i></p>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Infill Option</b>	
	<p>This option could deliver in the region of 83 homes, which allowing for 40% affordable means 33 'Council' rent homes. The new homes would be within HfL, whilst the remaining homes would be in the HRA.</p> <p>It is also not possible for any additional new development to provide cross-subsidy towards refurbishment; Homes for Lambeth would not be able to borrow money for refurbishment purposes. FC said the sale of land for a capital receipt was not a priority for Lambeth as would not deliver affordable homes, &amp; would not fund the refurbishment.</p> <p>VH asked why other receipts could not be used for CH. Where the estates delivered as standalone sites, or could there be cross-subsidy from the other 5 sites?</p> <p>NV said the issue was also about Value for Money.</p> <p>MB said that HfL was looking at an increase of homes over the next 50-60 years.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Part –retention (Properties near Gipsy Hill)</b>	
	This would mean the retention of units on Highland Rd, Vicars	

	<p>Oak and Central Hill, where investment costs were lower than elsewhere.</p> <p>This option was still being considered, but VFM and funding of these costs needed to be reviewed – and the impact on the viability and numbers of homes being delivered.</p> <p>MB said that this approach had taken place on Myatts Fields</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Redevelopment Options</b>	
	<p>BK presented 2 options – one with 874 homes &amp; a higher density option at 953 homes.</p> <p>NC said that it was difficult for residents to see what they were coming back to from the plans shown.</p> <p>BK outlined what an option appraisal was – it wasn't a detailed design for the estate, but showed an outline of numbers, layout, etc. that could be used in taking forward the next stage to achieve planning. (a masterplan process).</p> <p>NC asked about the number of houses – specifically with gardens.</p> <p>BK said there were 30-50 houses.</p> <p>NC compared this to 300 homes that have patio gardens.</p> <p>All new homes will have external space.</p> <p>NC also asked about why there was a high proportion on 2 beds being developed.</p> <p>It was explained that this where there is the highest need for 2 beds in the Borough and there is a level of overcrowding (&amp; under occupation) on the estate – there are very few 2 beds currently on CH.</p> <p>KB stated that there was a planning restriction on building over 6 storeys.</p> <p>BK said that planning would need to consider such issues – if appropriate, &amp; they would also look at room sizes, outside spaces, etc.</p> <p>NV said that there would need to be a level of comfort in relation to the increase in density, both with planning &amp; HfL. The design and 'place' would be within the control of HfL – not a developer. However, the financial model that supports the development would need to be a good investment for organisations who would lend the money.</p> <p>Questions were asked as to why the Day Centre was included within the options – as this building was felt 'not to be fit for purpose'.</p> <p><i>Discussions had taken place with Children, Adults &amp; Health Department, at this moment in time there was still a requirement for this facility, so it had been allowed – as any development is over a number of years and so this position could change.</i></p>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Other</b>	
	<p>LP again voiced the group's frustration in not getting the viability information to support the redevelopment options.</p> <p><i>A schedule of information requested is being drawn up.</i></p> <p>VH said that the key guarantees were as/more crucial for residents that the designs.</p>	AN/FC

	<p><i>Responses to key questions to be given to the group on 17/12/15.</i> In terms of whether there could be an early 'buy-back' process for leaseholders, this is being considered by LBL. The group thanked Jonathan (&amp; Pauline) for the use of the church and Xmas cakes.</p>	Sent 17/12
--	---	------------