

The Southwick Estate – Resident Working Group

Subject: Resident Working Group

Venue: Southwick Community Centre

Date: 25th April 2023

Present:

Imogen Spencer-Dale – Cratus
Communications (ISD)

Morven Rushworth – Cratus Communications
(MR)

Jeanette Kenyon – Adur District Council (JK)

Rob Lantsbury – New Mill (RL)

Christine Searle – New Mill (CS)

Leanne Crump – (LC)

Dave Jenner – (DJ)

Seb Brown – (SB)

Jasmine Johnson – (JJ)

Adele Rate – (AR)

Sue Wells (SW)

Jemma Wood (JW)

Other Southwick Residents

Item	Comment	Assigned to:
1	Introduction	
1.1	JK led introductions. Apologies had been received from Cllrs O’Neal and Funnell.	
2	Previous Meeting Minutes and Matters Arising	
2.1	JK noted that Tina Favier (TF), the Director of Communities at Adur District Council, had circulated a newsletter to residents. JK also confirmed that TF had made a note of the reported mould and damp issues and had addressed all specific items with individuals.	
3	Consultation feedback	
3.1	ISD noted the things that people liked about refurbishment included staying in the same flat, same location, and having the same layout. The team will take this into account in the plans and is considering measures to ensure the existing community stays together in redevelopment. Most of the estate said they would prefer full redevelopment except Watling Court. JK noted that they will internally review Watling Court, after the development of each phase meaning that Watling Court could be redeveloped in a later phase, if residents’ preferences change over time. RL added that the decision is likely to be subject to a ballot.	
4.	Next Steps	
4.1	JK discussed the next steps. The team is reviewing the consultation research, looking at design and financial viability and pulling together a comprehensive report. This will be sent to the council officers, informal cabinet, and relevant sub-committees before being reviewed by cabinet. The Council’s recommendation is for full redevelopment except for Watling Court.	

	<p>JK said that they could run a session on how the options appraisal and the business case which would be completed for this report.</p> <p>JK said it needs to wait for cabinet approval, if they were happy to proceed then a ballot would take place. JK added that if the Regulator of Social Housing wants to review the proposals, then there may be a delay.</p>	JK
4.2	<p>LC raised a concern about the number of social homes decreasing on site.</p> <p>JK said that the total number of social homes will not decrease with the redevelopment. ISD added that that while the percentage of social homes will decrease, this is because the total number of homes will increase. There will still be at least the same number of social homes, with one available for all current social housing residents on the estate. Planning conditions placed on any redevelopment would ensure no net loss of social housing.</p> <p>RL added that perhaps we should hold a planning session to clarify this and go into the practical issues. JK agreed that this is a good idea. JK also added this can be made clear within the Residents Charter.</p>	RL/ISD
4.3	<p>AR asked who will be involved in the ballot and asked how this was different from the consultation. JK explained that the consultation was simply giving information and asking for feedback to establish the preferred approach while the ballot would be a formal vote.</p> <p>RL added that there will be at least 21 days to cast a vote. RL explained that the council is not involved but it is run by a separate agency, and it will come down to a simple majority. Residents will be provided with all the information beforehand in a Landlord Offer Document. Non-resident leaseholders do not usually have a vote so that the decision can be down to those living on the estate.</p> <p>SB asked for clarification on what the vote will be on. RL explained that the Landlord Offer Document will provide more information on the proposed redevelopment and what this would entail. It would also have the commitments made by the council such as the Residents' Charter, and people will be asked if they are happy for this to go ahead, with a 'Yes' or 'No' answer.</p> <p>SB asked what happens if people vote 'No'. JK explained that the council would speak to residents to learn why and see if they can come back with a revised offer.</p> <p>SB asked if Watling Court would vote in the ballot and RL confirmed they would not as they are not included in the redevelopment plans.</p> <p>JK said they could produce a map to show which residents could vote.</p> <p>JK explained that following the ballot process, if there was a majority 'Yes' vote, no one would be moved out from the site for a few years.</p>	

4.4	<p>LC asked about Spring Gardens' involvement. JK explained that Spring Gardens was never in the proposal for redevelopment due to the status of this block. The team did go door-knocking to explain the overall process to them.</p> <p>JJ asked what will happen to Watling Court. RL explained that the proposal for them is for refurbishment instead of redevelopment.</p>	
4.5	<p>RL asked if the public could attend Cabinet meetings. The team reviewed post-meeting and confirmed that the public can attend. RL asked if they can share the details of the meeting with the group once the date is confirmed.</p>	JK
4.6	<p>AR asked what will happen to leaseholders if the redevelopment goes ahead.</p> <p>JK said they are looking into an early buy-back scheme for leaseholders, which would have to go to a council sub-committee for approval.</p> <p>The council has made commitments to leaseholders which would be included in the Landlord Offer Document.</p>	
4.7	<p>SB was concerned that if people do vote 'No' they won't specify why.</p> <p>JK noted this was a good point and the Residents' Charter will work to make that the proposal is as in line with their wants as possible. The RWG will have the opportunity to look at the proposal from the council beforehand.</p> <p>JK added that they want this to be collaborative and resident led, subject to the constraints of financial viability.</p>	
4.8	<p>JJ asked if residents would be able to move out if full redevelopment goes ahead.</p> <p>JK said this was a possibility and the team is looking at the phasing strategy to take this into account.</p> <p>RL asked if the council would investigate a priority moving-out status for certain residents. JK partially agreed, however added that other considerations need to be made such as trying to minimise the amount of moves per household.</p> <p>SB asked what would happen to empty council housing. JK said that they can't answer this yet as they are unsure how long any flats would be empty, but they would have a policy relating to this.</p> <p>JK added that the council will look to see if they can also build more social rent housing. SB asked if this would be in the proposal and JK agreed and said that they can include this in the residents' charter. JK noted that they must build homes for private sale to fund the cost of the social housing.</p>	RL/ISD

	<p>A resident asked for clarification on when the redevelopment would take place in phases and will people in later stages be able to make the decision to leave the development earlier on.</p> <p>JK explained that there would be modelling where they look at how the phasing would work, and that the team are looking into the buy-back scheme as well.</p>	
4.9	<p>RL asked whether the Council is involved in the development of the Pilot pub site.</p> <p>JK said the council has tried to purchase the site in the past, but their offer was turned down. There is a possibility that an offer could be submitted in the future.</p>	
5	Interim Works	
5.1	<p>JK updated the group that the team has produced the final figures for leaseholder charges in relation to the interim works. This is now going to be sent to the Asset Management Sub-group for review to assess the eligible and non-eligible service charges for leaseholders.</p> <p>JK said the work will not begin until the section 20 notices have gone out, which is the official notice that the council intends to carry out works that leaseholders must contribute towards.</p> <p>AR asked if it is different for each block. JK explained each block has been reviewed individually but many have common problems.</p>	
5.2	<p>DJ asked when this work would be done, asking if it was necessary with redevelopment coming. JK said this has been considered, but the works have health and safety considerations and so must be carried out.</p>	
6	Any Other Business	
6.1	<p>LC said that work needs to be done on the Residents' Charter to make people feel confident that refurbishment would take place.</p> <p>JK agreed but added that refurbishment is something that would happen over a series of years and could take up to 50 years. Leanne added that this also needs to be clarified.</p> <p>A resident thanked the team as the rubbish reported at the last meeting has been removed.</p>	RL/ISD
6.2	<p>DJ noted there are terrible potholes along Southwick Street, JK agreed to notify the relevant council team.</p> <p>JJ asked for the blocked door and intercom in Grange Court to be fixed. The team will email TF to have this urgently looked at.</p>	JK/ISD JK/ISD
6.3	<p>ISD invited the group to suggest things to include or advertise in the next newsletter.</p>	All

7	Close	