

## The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

### MINUTES

**Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 9**

**Venue: Southwick Community Centre**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

---

#### Present:

Dave Donaldson (DD) – Resident and Chair  
Jeanette Kenyon (JK) - Adur Council  
Cian Cronin (CC) – Adur Council  
Imogen Spencer-Dale (ISD) - Southwick Estate Resident Liaison Team  
Christine Searle – Independent Resident Advisor, New Mill  
Rob Lantsbury – Independent Resident Advisor, New Mill  
Cllr Jim Funnell (JF)  
Cllr Carol O’Neal (CO)  
Marilyn Foster (MF)  
Emma Colfer  
Lynda Hilton  
Anamaria Horaru  
Sue Wells  
Heather Jordan  
Leanne Crump (LC)  
Marcia Browne (MB)  
Seb Browne (SB)

Dave Jenner (DJ)  
Jasmine Johnson  
Jemma Wood  
Joe Wood  
Paul West (PW)  
Suz Wells  
Lynda Hilton  
Heather Jordan  
Becky Everson  
Alan Ebers  
Thomas Ebers  
Matthew Ebers  
Leon Lawadi  
Agata Martin  
Jared Cole  
Rana Begum  
M. Morado  
Other residents of the Southwick Estate

| Item | Comments   | Action Assigned To |
|------|--|--------------------|
| 1    | <b>WELCOME</b><br><br>DD led introductions.<br><br>JK said this session is an open discussion.   |                    |
| 2    | <b>Previous meeting minutes and matters arising</b>  |                    |
| 2.1  | Draft minutes from the meeting will be circulated, at future meetings they will not be displayed on the screen, but members are welcome to bring comments along.   |                    |
| 3    | <b>Accessibility</b><br><br>LC asked about those who cannot attend events and do not have the internet. JK said the information is all online and newsletters will be delivered with information included. The team also carry out door knocking sessions.<br><br>SB raised a point about translation issues. JK to investigate. |                    |
| 4    | <b>Background and consultation</b>   |                    |

## The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

### MINUTES

**Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 9**

**Venue: Southwick Community Centre**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
|            | <p>JK ran through the presentation and explained it is designed to cover all questions that have come up so far. ISD to send presentation around afterwards.</p> <p>SB asked how the scoring works. JK said there will be a sheet of each option and how it meets the standards, the resident brief, design parameters and sustainability. The Resident Working Group will help with this. SB said some items are missing such as security, JK suggested a Residents Charter be drawn up and feed into the scoring.</p> <p>CO said she was pleased to see so many attending and that all views need to be solicited. JK said the team will analyse feedback from the consultation and run targeted door knocking sessions, as well as visiting vulnerable residents. The ideal feedback from the engagement would be 60-80% of residents.</p> <p>A member asked whether the team had taken on board the suggestion of adding names to letters, JK confirmed they had, and this will be the plan going forward.</p> <p>LC said some residents are anxious and will not open the door.</p> | ISD |
| <b>5</b>   | <b>Interim Priority Works</b>  |     |
|            | <p>PW said he is anxious himself about the process, after refurbishment was cancelled due to Covid-19.</p> <p>CO said that planning permission had been granted by the council for Rock Close and Locks Court, it is still in place, and asked if that pot of money could be added into this? JK to investigate.</p> <p>DJ said that the inner room works were disrupting lives and making rooms smaller and questioned why this had taken place when the homes may be knocked down. JK said no decision had been made on whether to redevelop or refurbish at this stage.</p> <p>The group requested that the team refrained from using the word 'decant' when referring to moving people.</p> <p>A member asked about the budget for the Interim Priority Works given the Council's debt. JK said there is funding specifically allocated for these works.</p>   | JK  |
| <b>6</b>   | <b>Consultation Options</b>  |     |
| <b>6.1</b> | <p>A member asked about provision for parking in Option 2 (New Homes &amp; Improvements) JK said parking plans are still under consideration.</p> <p>PW said there are explosion risks to the works, DD responded that the port does not necessarily have fertiliser and that permission had been granted with full</p>  |     |

## The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

### MINUTES

**Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 9**

**Venue: Southwick Community Centre**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

|     |  |        |
|-----|--|--------|
|     | <p>awareness of the issue. JK reiterated that no decision has been made on the plans.</p> <p>MF said that Sea House was built in the 1960s, DD added that Sea House was probably the soundest of all Adur Council owned blocks, whereas the mortar between the brickwork of Channel View was in a very bad condition. JF added that the cement mix was not great quality. JK said there would be surveys carried out.</p> <p>SB asked if anyone would have to move and said people should know the answer to this for each option. This will be added into the Frequently Asked Questions document for residents.</p> <p>LC asked which options would mean people have to move. JK said there would be no need to move with Options 1 (Repairs &amp; Refurbishment) and 2 (New Homes &amp; Improvements) the main issue would be the building work disruption. CC added it would be an ongoing programme over 50 years.</p> <p>A member asked if their tenancies will be secure, JK said yes, they will.</p> | JK/ISD |
| 6.2 | <p>JK said the blocks shown as redevelopment or refurbishment on Option 3 (Partial Redevelopment) are just examples, this could change.</p> <p>It would be done in phases, a new block would be built for people to be moved straight into from their existing block, then that block would be redeveloped and so forth. All tenants and resident leaseholders will be guaranteed a return to a home on the estate.</p> <p>DJ noted there would be a loss of green space. JK said the picture is just indicative and that the plans would have to adhere to design and planning requirements.</p>  |        |
| 6.3 | <p>SB asked if people will be forced to move, and that it must be made clear so people can make an informed decision. LC added people have a right to a home.</p> <p>JK said if a redevelopment option was chosen residents would be required to move, but it would be a process of negotiation. JK reiterated that all tenants will be offered a new home and they will work to make sure they are happy with the flat offered. She mentioned the redevelopment options would be delivered in phases and offers to residents would take place over a number of years.</p> <p>A member asked if there were any examples of previous schemes where the residents said no to refurbishment, JK confirmed this has happened.</p>  |        |

## The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

### MINUTES

**Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 9**

**Venue: Southwick Community Centre**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

|            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
|            | <p>LC asked if all feedback was included and all forms kept, DD said this is the case and reiterated that tenancies will be secure.</p>   |  |
| <b>6.4</b> | <p>PW asked if the new homes would be private, JK replied there would be a mix of private and council housing.</p> <p>PW said he was concerned they could become second homes, said that he had a view of the harbour and did not want to lose that to Londoners. JK said many councils have policies stating new market sale homes must first be offered to local people.</p> <p>DJ said the residents want secure council tenancies and not housing association tenancies and asked if the new homes will be affordable. JK said there will be a mix of council and market sales, the model would be council-owned with secure tenancies, and all rights would be preserved.</p> <p>LC asked to have it in writing because she has seen the secure tenancies phased out. She asked if her children could inherit her flat, JK said yes. LC questioned how long it had taken to receive answers. JK said that assessing the options has taken some time.</p>   |  |
| <b>6.5</b> | <p>A member asked how finances would work if the value of new homes is higher. JK said resident leaseholders would be able to buy a shared equity home and rent would not be charged on the part they did not own. 'Staircasing' would be possible – purchasing more of your home or buying it outright.</p> <p>LC asked what would happen to the tenants of non-resident leaseholders. JK said the council would commit to providing an equivalent market rented homes.</p> <p>A member asked what happens with Option 4 (Full Redevelopment). JK said the first phase of residents may move off the estate, but it would be temporary, nearby and they would have the right to return. Rents would be preserved.</p> <p>DJ said there is historical mistrust of the Council. He asked why Coates Court has empty ground floor flats. JK to investigate.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note: there are two empty flats on the estate, and this is due to severe issues that need fixing before new tenants move in.</i></p> <p>JK said she her approach is to work with residents in partnership and she would like to build trust.</p> <p>LC said that all the examples of regeneration she has seen tenants have lost their tenancies. JK said the regeneration case studies she would share with the meeting demonstrate that in all cases residents' security of tenure is protected.</p> |  |

## The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

### MINUTES

**Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 9**

**Venue: Southwick Community Centre**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
| <b>6.6</b> | <p>A member asked whether the new properties would be like-for-like. JK said there would be assessments of needs, and they would aim to offer like for like. Multiple flats could be offered during negotiations and flats could even be designed based on individual's needs.</p> <p>LC asked if tenants would keep extra rooms even when children have moved out. CC said it is written in the tenancies and it will remain the same.</p> <p>SB asked if the Council would just do what they want. JK again suggested the idea of a Residents' Charter drafted by New Mill, the independent tenant advisors, and signed by the RWG. This could be used to hold the Council to account.</p>   |  |
| <b>7</b>   | <b>Case studies</b>  |  |
| <b>7.1</b> | <p>JK ran through the case study presentation. She explained when it says benefits this means what the residents said they liked about the schemes.</p> <p>Cambridge Estate case study is the closest to the Adur Council model. MB said she had read that in this scheme the flats given were smaller. JK said the Council would work with residents to ensure they were happy with the design of the new homes if that option was chosen.</p> <p>A member asked how long the Maiden Lane scheme took, JK to investigate.</p> <p>JK said in the past housing association mainly built social housing, but the law has changed allowing local authorities to build council housing again and in the last five years local authority led regeneration programme have started to grow.</p> <p>There are a number of historical estate regeneration projects that have not gone well. These have been led by housing associations, in the main. Adur's regeneration model is like the Cambridge Estate model; led by the Council, working with a private developer and contractor. The Council would own the new council homes and remain the landlord.</p> |  |
| <b>7.2</b> | <p>A member asked what the motivation is for the Council. JK said it is both financial and practical, and they want to give residents security. She mentioned the Resident Charter as an example of the security.</p> <p>LC asked how the Council cannot afford refurbishment, giving the example of if it costs £50,000 to refurbish and £50,000 to knock down. JK said that is not the case. If the refurbishment option were chosen, it would be undertaken over many years with an annual budget set aside by the Council.</p> <p>SB said if the new homes are modular and cheap and asked whether new blocks didn't need more construction. JK said modular buildings are used on regeneration projects. Option 2 (New Homes and Improvements) considers the</p>  |  |

## The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

### MINUTES

**Subject: Resident Working Group, Meeting 9**

**Venue: Southwick Community Centre**

**Date: 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

|            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
|            | <p>possibility of adding floors to existing blocks, modular construction could be used in this instance.</p> <p>SB thanked JK for the case studies and said he had read that in some other regeneration projects, some people had moved and ended up with smaller homes and the councils had changed their minds.</p> <p>JK said the Resident Charter would underpin the commitments. She said it is a new era of local authority led housing regeneration. JK is aware previous schemes have had problems, but the Council is committed to ensuring this would not happen.</p> <p>SB asked about the Aylesbury project where tenants lost their homes. JK said that was a very different situation, it was housing association led regeneration programme with financial problems. The Council's regeneration model is local authority led.</p> <p>CC said that schemes like Aylesbury and other past issues have shown Adur Council what not to do for this process so they can avoid any similar issues.</p> |  |
| <b>8</b>   | <b>Any other business</b>   |  |
| <b>8.1</b> | <p>A member asked what the maximum height of any potential new buildings would be. JK said 10 storeys would be the maximum.</p> <p>DD closed the meeting and JK asked everyone to email any further questions.</p>  |  |
| <b>9</b>   | <i>Post meeting note: the next meeting will be 2<sup>nd</sup> August 6pm-7.30pm</i>   |  |