

Feed back from Homeowner and Tenant Council and Area Housing Forums

APPENDIX 4

Forum	Comment
HOC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAHF was annoyed that as activists that the AHF was the first time that they had seen the documentation. • Would like clear definitions of language we use e.g. renewal and affordability • Use of Green spaces for is a concern • Impact of right to buy a concern
TC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSB is working the on the ratio of flats that should be built for council and for sale with the council. • We need to look into the costing with local people. • Good communication is the key Lend lease at the Elephant is a good example. • We should educate ourselves as part of the process. • Tenants should be consulted through the consultation structure
FSB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the length of the consultation (28 July) – period of consultation extended from 22 September to 13 October in response • Will pledges be kept • Approach should not be one size fits all • Confidence in the council is still low • Need to be imaginative in how deliver start with hidden homes which is less threatening • Need to make sure that people are kept informed all through the process • Concern about approach using Community conversations rather than through the TRAs and AHF • Council needs to be more open about its information and in particular the financial information should be independently verified so that people can trust what they are being told
Peckham Area Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pledges good on paper – are they deliverable? – need to put something in place about monitoring them • So many consultations taking place how do we manage the whole process • Need to clearly define roles and responsibilities so people know what they can influence and have the right expectations • Involve everyone not pick and choose • Bring in people with fresh perspectives and identify new groups
Peckham and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation time scale is very tight

Nunhead Area Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 year pledge is not relevant • Concerns about the words e.g. regeneration that implies that something bigger being proposed • What about buy to let? And the impact this has on our estates can we prevent the new homes being used in this way. • There are already derelict and empty spaces these should be looked at first e.g. on Cossall Estate.
Dulwich Area Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The time frame for this consultation is tight • Rents on new homes need to be affordable for Council tenants • Document uses technical terms without explanation and is too detailed • Principles are good, but we will see if the detail delivers • Concern about the use of open spaces to build new homes and the loss of amenity
Bermondsey West Area Forum	<p>The forum agreed and embraced all pledges. Observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pledge 1 - We will promote sharing knowledge sideways across local schemes as a way strengthening cohesion and experience (a lessons learned thing) • Pledge 2 - we will ensure that a proper scheme of training is evolved to empower residents to fully participate in these processes • Pledge 5 - We will work to ensure that room sizes are sufficient to meet peoples' needs and expectations given the background of room size of Southwark's existing housing stock.
Bermondsey East Area Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised a concern that leaseholders especially elderly would not be able to afford to buy even with pledge 6. • Asked about provision of schools and doctors surgeries etc to deal with the 11k new homes.
Camberwell East Area Forum	Not quorate
Camberwell West Area Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new buildings should have the proper standards and regulations. • A discussion about why people don't participate. • With the new build planned 11,000 new homes. There will be some displacement. • Concern about density and design standards meaning that buildings are too close together • There needs to be a strategy for consulting with the young people. They are the future.

Walworth West Area Forum	<p>Pledge 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this happen on an estate by estate basis? How do you define an area? • What are the options and opportunities? <p>Pledge 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you identify sites? How do you get people to agree on these sites? • Will these be new or just refurbished homes? • Will Southwark be able to buy-back sites they have sold off but aren't being developed? • Can we identify sites? <p>Pledge 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will Southwark open up the procurement process to new contractors? The existing ones keep on being re-contracted and we are not satisfied with the standards. • There is a problem with the contractors in my own flat –lack of quality control. The council needs to ensure this is taken care of in connection with the investment programme • Need to build up trust by combating shoddy workmanship <p>Pledge 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But I already have a home? What does this mean for me? <p>Pledge 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will you ensure local employment and skills? <p>Pledge 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at what happened with the Aylesbury. • Do we know some of these sites already? • Who is responsible for selling off the Aylesbury? <p>Any other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultation could have been more open (i.e. pledges not already drafted) • The consultation may be difficult for people to understand
Walworth East Area Forum	<p>Passed the following motion: “We deplore how the so called consultation has been carried out, a short time scale with a lack of tenant involvement.</p>

	<p>We strongly object to the building of new council homes being dependent on redevelopment of estates and demolition. We will support any T&RA'S that oppose demolition plans. “</p> <p>concern was expressed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • few people were aware of the council’s ‘community conversation’ seeking views on the build of 11,000 new homes. • the proposed £50/sq metre Community Infrastructure Levy within zone 2, comprising the highest density of council estates, and was concerned that the consultation period of one month was too short. • 11,000 homes would not be new, but would be rebuilt on existing estates. • Lack of tenant involvement and said that the demolition plans must be opposed by T&RAs.
<p>Borough and Bankside Area Forum</p>	<p>Not met in the time frame.</p>
<p>Rotherhithe Area Forum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer consultation period required for phase one • Support for the building of new homes. • Agreed with emphasis on local consultation and input • The right to return to homes and estates was a priority • Rent levels were raised <p>In addition the forum raised concerns about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSB felt it was not representative there is a general notion that their area is underrepresented • Who will be building the homes a lot of references to existing RSL arrangements and secured and assured tenancies for new build • The group felt Estate renewal = estate demolition •
<p>Aylesbury Area Forum</p>	<p>Nothing to report back</p>

Wider Tenant Organisations	Comments
SGTO Comments	<p>Pledge 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Wording of the questionnaire is ambiguous, and can be misinterpreted •What are the factors that the council will use to determine if an estate is a success •Concern about consultation scope and that it should go through democratic organisations •Southwark has legal obligation to consult this should not replace that •Concern about lack of clarity on who is being consulted <p>Pledge 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Concern about one size fits all approach •Southwark has legal obligation to consult this should not replace that •Setting up of project boards may undermine TRAs consultation appears undemocratic <p>Pledge 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How will commercial sensitivity affect the council’s commitment that it will work with residents on every part of the programme <p>Pledge 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Concern that setting up TMOs used as a means of outsourcing difficult management decisions to residents •Stepping stone to privatisation <p>Pledge 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Query about what is meant by affordable, target and formula •Some language disparaging to existing communities •Concern that consultation is a means to deliver stock transfer •Council homes in all areas of the borough •All council homes should have secure tenancies <p>Pledge 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Stronger commitment and compensation towards those rehoused including homeowners who should be able to buy back their new property •Concern that demolition is main aim •No commitment to be rehoused on same estate •No reduction in Council Housing – older and vulnerable tenants should be allowed to stay •Is 11,000 net gain concerned about RTB <p>In addition the group will be commenting as indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Yes to more homes at genuinely affordable rents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •No to estate redevelopment without consultation with estate reps and a ballot of all residents affected •Council homes demolished replaced on a like for like basis •All existing tenants to be rehoused on same estate with council rents and Secure tenancies •All leaseholders to be offered compensation at market value based on the area value
<p>Defend Council Homes</p>	<p>Has produced a document in response to the consultation. This has not been sent in to the team as part of the consultation however a copy was obtained from Bell's Gardens Community Centre.</p> <p>Their overall concern is that our pledges imply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The council intends to demolish homes on a large number of estates •There will be no additional homes for ordinary residents •Estates will be rebuilt at much higher density •Looks to experience at Heygate and Aylesbury to frame their response <p>In addition they comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The need for investment in estates should not be at the expense of demolition and gentrification •New homes should be built on Brownfield sites not estate open spaces on existing estates with estate residents the right to determine what is appropriate •This consultation is not proper length •The consultation does not reflect the outcomes of the Housing Commission •Their concern about development partners and the level of future rent •Project teams may not be democratic, risk that power is concentrated in the hands of a few unrepresentative minority •Resident management needs considerable support and oversight •To ensure high standards there is a need for independent sign off of homes and public realm •Better explanation of terms such as affordable target and formula •Rents of new homes need to take into account the low level of wages in the borough •New Council Housing must be let on secure tenancies