

The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

MINUTES

Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 7

Venue: Southwick Community Centre

Date: 6th April 2022

Present:

Chelsea Reilly (CR) - Southwick Estate Resident
Liaison Team (Chair)
Jeanette Kenyon (JK) - Adur Council
Jake Lock (JL) – Adur Council
Neil Erridge (NE) – Adur Council
Christine Searle (CS) – Independent Resident
Advisor, New Mill
Rob Lantsbury (RL) - Independent Resident
Advisor, New Mill
James Felstead (JF) – Child Graddon Lewis
Laura Griffiths (LG) – Child Graddon Lewis

Uxue Ojanguren (UO) – Child Graddon Lewis
Cllr Carol O’Neal
Cllr Jim Funnell
Leanne Crump (LC)
Marilyn Foster (MF)
Dave Jenner (DJ)
Paul Hillier (PH)
Sharon Hillier (SH)
David Lonsdale (DL)
Emma Colfer (EC)
Leah Sawyer (LS)

Item	Comments	Action Assigned To
1	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	
1.1	CR led introductions.	
2	MAINTENANCE UPDATE	
2.1	<p>NK provided an update on maintenance and repairs.</p> <p>The netting between Channel View and Sea House has been removed - the group advised this is not the case, NE to check.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: NE confirmed the netting has been removed. The ladder remains in place as the scaffolding will be removed shortly.</i></p> <p>All communal doors will be repaired, and works are underway, starting at Coates Court.</p> <p>The Rock Court roof has been repaired, with a small amount of lead work outstanding.</p> <p>The group agreed progress has improved following Neil’s appointment.</p>	NE
2.2	<p>The group asked why the scaffolding was installed and why it has remained in place for so long.</p> <p>Cllr Funnell added that Adur Homes’ response to this question is the scaffolding remains in place because of the ongoing consultation process.</p> <p>JL to investigate this and update the group.</p>	JL
2.3	<p>Cllr O’Neill raised a number of health and safety concerns at Watling Court, such as the masonry falling off the structure.</p> <p>Cllr O’Neill and Neil to speak offline.</p>	NE / Cllr O’Neal

The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

MINUTES

Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 7

Venue: Southwick Community Centre

Date: 6th April 2022

3	Introduction to the design options JF provided an introduction to the process and an overview of each option.	
3.1	JK introduced the workshop session and explained the purpose of this evening is to share first impressions of each of the options, to understand the pros and cons of each approach. JK asked the group to consider the boards in the context of the resident's brief, and place and community objectives. The boards shown will be used at the third consultation event taking place in May.	
3.2	JF introduced the boards and explained they are not a concrete proposal, the architects are illustrating the approaches that could be taken. If any of these proposals are taken forward, there is a lot more work to do.	
3.3	Concerns were raised around the impact of residents' feedback shared today. JF reassured the group that design is not a linear process, it is circular with opportunities for feedback built-in at every stage. At this stage, the team is trying to understand the preferred approach to the estate as a whole, whilst balancing this with the individuals. There will be opportunities for detailed conversations once the preferred option has been chosen. JK added that once the design process is complete, the plans will journey through the planning process which is another opportunity for scrutiny and feedback.	JL
3.4	JF presented the options to the group. There are four different approaches, with each option taking on more change than the last. More change means greater opportunities. Option 1 Option 1 is the least intrusive, the focus will be on repairing specific issues with the buildings, the layout of the estate, public realm, and green space would broadly stay the same. This means Option 1 does not meet all the Residents' Brief or the Placemaking and Community Objectives, so the opportunities brought about by option 1 are limited. Option 2 Option 2 includes some new homes along with improvement works. Additional homes bring about new opportunities across the estate, such as improvements to parking or waste disposal facilities. JF advised that when considering this option, the architects found significant limitations around where new homes could go because of the layout of the estate. Option 3	

The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

MINUTES

Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 7

Venue: Southwick Community Centre

Date: 6th April 2022

	<p>Option 3 is a greater extent of work, this creates opportunities to improve open spaces, whilst meeting the council's sustainability objective.</p> <p>This option would see the blocks in the worst condition being rebuilt.</p> <p>Option 4</p> <p>The final option is a comprehensive development of the whole estate, bringing about the most change and the most opportunities.</p> <p>So, options 1 and 2 mean keeping the buildings but adding and repairing them, and options 3 and 4 consider the opportunities unlocked by partial or full demolition.</p>	
3.5	<p>LS asked how many bedrooms the new homes would have.</p> <p>JF explained there will be a mixture of sizes, ranging from studios or one-beds to three and four-bedroom homes. JK added there will be a housing needs assessment of the whole estate, and designs will be created around housing needs. JF said the mix and number of homes are to be decided but the team will start by re-providing all the existing homes.</p>	
3.6	<p>DJ queried the lack of green space and parking space, MF added that underground parking had previously been suggested but isn't reflected on any of the options.</p> <p>JF advised that parking provision is a key – and challenging - aspect of any planning application as parking is difficult to control e.g. commuters will park on the estate due to close proximity to the station.</p> <p>Possible solutions include underground parking or a podium strategy, whereby outdoor space is layered/multi-functional so serves a number of uses.</p>	
3.7	<p>LC felt the architect was not supportive of options 1-3, and encouraged residents towards option 4 (full redevelopment).</p> <p>LC was concerned about why option 4 was brightly coloured with blue skies whereas the other options were dull in appearance with grey skies.</p> <p>LC added that the information presented was dissuasive and incorrect.</p> <p>LC also felt that two of the three tables had votes, her table did not.</p>	
4	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
5	CLOSE	
5.1	<p>CR thanked the group for coming.</p>	