

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: 18 November 2020	Decision Maker: Cabinet Member for Housing
Report title:		Decision on the final option for the Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild Programme	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Old Kent Road	
From:		Head of Regeneration	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. To take forward redevelopment of the low-rise homes as the final option to be put to a Resident Ballot in the Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild Programme as described in Option 5.

This option results in:

- The demolition and replacement with new homes of Bowness House, Heversham House, Hilbeck Close, Kentmere House & Ullswater House
 - Retention of the houses in Manor Grove with improvements to the tenanted homes
 - New houses in between the houses and on Manor Grove itself
 - A new park in the centre of the estate
 - A new Pilgrims' Way School
 - New retail and business spaces on the Old Kent Road and Ilderton Road
2. That council tenants' housing needs and preferences of all residents on the estate, including those that are not due for redevelopment section, be considered as part of any Local Lettings Plan in the event of a positive ballot and development of new homes.
 3. That all residents on the estate, including those that are not due for redevelopment section, continue to have an opportunity to contribute to design options for the wider estate.
 4. This option will be subject to securing planning permission and a delivery partner alongside further financial scrutiny.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. The Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild Programme was initiated in May 2019. It is also known as the Tustin Estate low-rise programme. This programme of work seeks to improve the quality of the low-rise homes on the

estate, build more council homes where resident opinion supports this, and improve the wider environment on the estate to support quality of life. This programme of engagement on options for the future of the low-rise homes and the wider estate re-started engagement that did not progress in 2016. The engagement programme has been developed so that residents can lead decision making on the future of the estate.

6. The Tustin Estate comprises of a mixed typology of homes. It is made up on three towers currently undergoing major refurbishment and consisting of 217 households and 13 new hidden homes; one block of non-self contained flats in use as a hostel for residents seeking temporary accommodation (Ullswater); four low rise blocks of flats and maisonettes and terraced houses. The tenure on the estate is also mixed and includes those looking for temporary accommodation; council tenants; private tenants; resident and non-resident leaseholders as well as resident and non-resident freeholders.
7. The programme sits within the framework of Southwark Council's Council Plan which seeks to build more new homes; the Housing Strategy 2043 which seeks to invest in homes, establishes a target for 11,000 new homes at Council rent levels and supports homeownership; the Great Estates 'expand and enrich' programme which seeks to identify appropriate sites on our estates for building new council homes and find new ways of working with residents to improve the look, feel and lived experience of our estates; and the Protocol for Consideration of New Homes, Charter of Principles.
8. This programme has also been developed in line with the Mayor of London's Good Practice Guide to Estate Regeneration and resident ballot for estate regeneration requirements. The Mayor of London has placed a condition on landlords to carry out a resident ballot to be eligible for funding for new affordable homes.
9. The Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild Programme is a programme of engagement and resident-led decision making on the future of the estate. At the outset of the programme four options for the estate were identified and shared with residents at a public meeting in June 2019 as follows:
 - Do nothing
 - Refurbish blocks and extend or build more homes between existing blocks
 - Knock down some or all of the blocks and replace them with new ones
 - Improve and / or expand the school and business space
10. Subsequent to the June 2019 public meeting the options have evolved through discussion with residents, the Resident Project Group and the Tustin Community Association (TCA). A number of steps have informed this evolution, notably the drafting of the feasibility and master-planning design brief with resident input; emerging, latest and final options estate wide meetings held between November 2019 and March 2020 and weekly drop in

design events held between December 2019 and March 2020.

11. In April 2020, the programme was due to ask residents which options were their preferred options and rank them in order of preference. This was postponed at the outset of the Covid-19 pandemic as events and meetings were no longer possible and as services were directed to essential services only. The programme was re-started in July 2020.
12. Upon re-starting the programme, work sought to re-engage residents in the process. A telephone based engagement exercise was undertaken by the Resident Services Officers from the Ledbury Team reaching 77% of all households on the Tustin Estate, including those residing in the towers.
13. Upon re-starting the programme, the approach to Ullswater was re-evaluated due to the typology of the accommodation in this block as well as the condition of the block itself. As accommodation in this block is non-self contained, living arrangements do not enable social isolation and it was not Covid-19 safe. As such residents living in this block were offered alternative accommodation. The quality of the accommodation was also considered further in light of the stock condition survey finalised in Spring 2020 and work taking place elsewhere in the Council regarding its approach to temporary accommodation. It was agreed that whatever the outcome of the whittling down survey on Tustin, the site would be redeveloped for new homes.
14. With residents re-engaged, the school and the businesses updated on the programme, it was agreed to start the next phase of engagement on the options, the 'Ranking the Options' survey on the Final Options as of March 2020. The exercise sought to participation from those eligible to vote in a GLA compliant 'Resident Ballot'. Participants were asked to rank the options from favourite to least favourite.
15. The options survey sought to identify one preferred option that had resident support via a single transferable vote and to understand resident opinion on a housing block by housing block basis as well as by tenure. The option for residents to explain why they had ranked the options in the way they had was also included in the survey to gain more insight into resident opinion.
16. The final option will be put to a Resident Ballot, where agreed by Cabinet to proceed with this. The Resident Ballot will ask residents to vote 'yes' or 'no' on the final option. A yes vote is a vote for the final option. A 'no' vote is a vote for Option 1 to repair and maintain the low-rise homes and the wider estate.
17. The exercise was carried out independently by Open Communities and the results of the survey have been shared with residents via the monthly newsletter and the full report on the results from Open Communities has been published on the Tustin webpage.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

18. This report recommends the redevelopment of the low-rise homes in accordance with Option 5 as the final option to progress to Cabinet in January 2021 and eventually a Resident Ballot in February 2021.
19. Key issues for consideration support the decision making process. The key issues for consideration for this decision include development of a range of deliverable options; transparent engagement; inclusive, accessible and full engagement; the design of the survey and the results of the survey.

Development of a range of deliverable options – Options feasibility

20. In Autumn 2019, four options for the low rise homes on the estate were proposed to residents as:
- Option 1 – ‘Maintain the Estate only’ with enhanced landscaping
 - Option 2 – Refurbishment and infill
 - Option 3 – Partial refurbishment and partial demolition
 - Option 4 – Full demolition and rebuild
21. In order for meaningful engagement with residents to take place, the options presented to residents required feasibility testing not only by residents but also by specialists including surveyors, architects and financial modelers.
22. As such, work on an independent stock condition survey of the low-rise homes and wider estate, with supporting surveys, was commissioned to inform Option 1.
23. Architectural design and community engagement services were appointed to develop the designs of Options 2 – 4. The design team’s engagement with residents resulted in the development of a fifth option for the low-rise home programme. This option, Option 5, took on board feedback from Manor Grove residents. This option sought to maintain the freehold houses in Manor Grove alongside redevelopment of the low rise homes and improvements to the wider estate.
24. Additional pieces of work were procured to consider the impacts of the five options. An Equalities and Health Impact (EHIA), a Green Book Compliant Cost Benefits Analysis (CBA) and Financial Viability. These pieces of work were sought to provide the council, residents, school and business community with additional tools to evaluate the options.
25. The EHIA identifies the risk and opportunities of each of the options related to equalities and health outlining mitigating measures to minimise risks during the works arising from the options, as well as identifying the impacts on completion of the works. The CBA looked at the economic case for the options as well as qualitative outcomes related to the local economy,

environment, community, and changes related to moving home.

26. Together these pieces of work have sought to establish feasibility, costs and impacts of the each of the options and in turn inform decision-making for residents and the council.
27. The council were satisfied that the five options presented were feasible but acknowledge the varying impacts, risks and opportunities presented by each option that would need to be considered further prior to the Resident Ballot.

Transparent engagement

28. In May 2019, the Tustin Community Association shared with the Council a Residents' Manifesto. The Manifesto provided a clear basis for the programme including expectations related to engagement, council commitments to residents, delivery of new homes, design, options for residents and the estate as well as management of the estate. The manifesto has been very useful tool that has provided the foundations for engagement.
29. An Independent Tenant and Homeowners Advisor was appointed to provide independent advice and support to residents.
30. In June 2019, when the first estate wide event took place, it was stressed at this public meeting that 'no decisions have been made'. Decision making on the options for the low-rise homes and the wider estate is led by residents.
31. A resident project group (RPG) was set up in June 2019. The RPG meets monthly to monitor and consult on work related to Tustin Estate Low Rise Programme. The terms of reference for this group support membership from residents from across the estate and the business and school community. The minutes of the meetings are available on the Southwark Tustin Website.
32. The RPG and residents were involved in the appointment of the design team. It was necessary to appoint a design team with an excellent approach to community. RPG members were asked to comment on the Design Brief. Stakeholders of the wider estate were invited to meet the consultant teams behind the three shortlisted submissions. Members of the RPG were invited to participate in the interview of the three shortlisted design teams.
33. RPG members and residents were also engaged in the work of the other consultant teams. The consultant teams shared information and answered questions both at RPG meetings and estate wide meetings, with the studies being shared for discussion prior to finalising. Final feasibility documents were available to all residents and stakeholders via the Southwark Council Tustin Webpage prior to the Options Survey taking place.
34. The options and their impacts as developed by the consultant team were

pulled together in a plain english booklet ('Options Information Pack') to explain the impacts of each option in terms of design, finance and the council's commitments to residents. The booklet also explained the process. This booklet was prepared with resident input and consultation exercises led by the Independent Tenant and Homeowners Advisor.

Inclusive, accessible and full engagement on the options

35. The engagement programme has used multiple methods of engaging with residents and the business and school community based on their needs and a demographic understanding of the estate. The engagement programme has been developed on the back on a 'Starting the conversation Questionnaire' which identified needs including language based needs.
36. Where translation and interpretation has been requested this has been made available. The offer of translation and interpretation has been included in consultation materials.
37. Methods of engagement include use of hand delivered monthly newsletters; a dedicated team of Resident Services Officers from the Ledbury Team home visiting, and post lockdown making telephone calls at each stage of the programme; use of dedicated Tustin Estate webpages; communications via email for those who have opted to receive email communication; letters; regular and multiple events encouraging one on one discussion as well as group discussion.
38. Events have been held in accessible locations on the estate and at times that allowed those of shift based and office based hours to engage as well as those who are unemployed, retired or a full time carer.
39. Engagement events sought resident input into the masterplan principles for the estate and options for the homes. Development of the final options has been based on ongoing consultation and use of weekly drop in sessions but have been developed using three critical steps: 1) emerging ideas 2) latest options 3) final options. Feedback from these events had directly contributed to the final options.
40. Since the recommencement of consultation after the start of the pandemic, access to the internet and support accessing online meetings and events has been offered in all communications.
41. Information on the options were shared with residents ahead of asking them to participate in the Options Survey. The information was shared digitally in the form on an Options video which and a hand-delivered printed booklet titled the 'Options Information Pack'.
42. The use of an options survey sought residents to make participation inclusive and accessible. With information going directly to households, the aim was to achieve greater levels of participation that we has experienced via events, establish resident opinion and as such provide a more robust

process for decision making.

43. The survey allowed for multiple methods of returning the survey paper namely a pre-paid envelope, online submission, use of ballot box and collection by the independent organisation.

Design of the survey

44. The council are committed to ensuring the decision on the future of homes on the estate is led by residents. The survey was designed to identify one preferred option via a single transferable vote by asking residents to rank the five options in order of preference from most favourite to least favourite. Residents were also asked to explain why they had ranked the options in the way they had to gain a greater understanding of resident opinion. The design of the survey was discussed with the Resident Project Group on a number of occasions.
45. An independent organisation, Open Communities, carried out a formal survey of resident opinion on the options. Again to gain a greater understanding of resident opinion, Open Communities were asked to share the results on a block by block basis as well as on a tenure basis.
46. Due to the work the GLA has done on the requirements, the use of these requirements for the options survey is considered proportionate and reasonable. Additionally, it aids clarity in communications across the options survey and the resident ballot.
47. GLA Resident ballot requirements specify that the whole estate must be balloted. The estate boundary for Tustin Estate has therefore been applied, which meant that residents in the Towers as well as the low rise homes could take part. A number of residents in the Towers made it clear that they would not be taking part in the survey, as they believed that as it had more of a direct affect on residents in the low-rise homes. Therefore, the turn out from the Towers was expected to be lower than the low rise homes. The requirements also specify which residents are eligible to vote and voter eligibility was tested with residents asked, via letter, to highlight any voter eligibility issues in spring 2020 and again in summer 2020. Work done to identify eligible voters in Spring 2020, identified there were not eligible voters amongst those few remaining residents living on a license in Ullswater, who had the 12 monthly housing list eligibility qualification.

Survey results

48. Results of the survey can be found in Appendix 2 and the results of the open question asking residents to explain why they had ranked the options in the way they had can be found in Appendix 3.
49. There are a total number of 485 eligible voters on the Estate. There were 265 completed and counted papers representing 55% of the total number of eligible voters. 57% of the total number of voters submitted their ranking the

options paper. 2% of ballot papers were spoiled. The breakdown of respondents per block are as follows.

Low Rise Block	Potential Returns	Returns	%
Bowness	34	24	71%
Heversham	103	65	63%
Hillbeck	29	20	69%
Kentmere	34	25	74%
Manor Grove	59	42	71%
Tower Block			
Ambleside	83	40	48%
Grasmere	72	22	31%
Windermere	71	27	38%
Total	485	265	55%

50. It is notable that more there was lower representation from those living in the towers. Representation across the low-rise blocks was 70% while representation from the towers was 39%.

51. The results by rank are as below:

Total	Option 1	Option 1 (%)	Option 2	Option 2 (%)	Option 3	Option 3 (%)	Option 4	Option 4 (%)	Option 5	Option 5 (%)
Rank 1	40	15%	22	8%	33	12%	131	49%	39	15%
Rank 2	25	9%	47	18%	28	11%	34	13%	98	37%
Rank 3	23	9%	35	13%	128	48%	14	5%	24	9%
Rank 4	21	8%	111	42%	23	9%	19	7%	43	16%
Rank 5	124	47%	13	5%	11	4%	47	18%	24	9%

52. The results of the survey identify that no option received the 50% plus one quota required by a Single Transferrable Vote (STV). Option 4, Demolition and Rebuild of the Low Rise Homes, was the closest to this figured and obtained 49.4% of the vote.

53. As the quota had not been achieved, the votes were redistributed in line with the STV method, with the result that Option 4 achieved the quota as follows:

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Rank 1	40 - 15%	22 - 8%	33 - 12%	131 - 49%	39 - 15%
Redistribute Option 2	52 - 20%		39 - 15%	131 - 50%	39 - 15%
Redistribute Option 3	64 - 25%			147 - 56%	49 - 19%

54. The results show that on a block-by-block basis, Option 4 was the highest ranked option by the most number of respondents except at Manor Grove.

55. Option 1 was the highest ranked option by the most number or respondents at Manor Grove at 33%, with Option 5 at 31%, Option 4 at 19%, Option 3 at 10% and Option 2 at 7%.

56. A whole estate preference across blocks has therefore not emerged from the Option Survey.

57. By way of comparison, a similar exercise was carried out at the Ledbury Estate, when residents completed a questionnaire on the refurbishment options that were put forward to them in 2017 on the way forward for the Ledbury Estate. Turn out of papers was 30.2% with a 51.41% turn out for existing residents of the estate.

Decision Making on the Final Option

58. A whole estate preference from each of the blocks did not emerge from the option survey. The results showed a majority within each of the blocks were in favour of demolition and rebuild of the whole estate (option 4) except for Manor Grove. The results identified that respondents from Manor Grove ranked option 1 as the highest ranked (33%) with Option 5 as the second highest ranked option (31%).

59. Both the results of the options survey and subsequent discussions held with Manor Grove residents highlight the different position of residents of Manor Grove. Manor Grove comprises 49 houses, the only houses on the estate, with 31 of the houses being in freehold ownership and with 25 of these freehold properties occupied by resident freeholders.

60. The recommendation for the redevelopment of Tustin Estate in line with Option 5 is the culmination of engagement on the estate to date. The development of Option 5, from the four initial options, is based on feedback received from residents through Spring 2020. This option seeks to ensure residents can afford to remain living on the estate and to keep the community together.

61. The recommendation takes account of the survey results majority vote for comprehensive redevelopment in line with Option 4 across the estate as well as the Manor Grove result that identified a strong preference for both Option 1 and Option 5. This option represents a redevelopment option that allows for the benefits of both Option 4 and option 5 to be realised. This includes the creation of a new park and improved open spaces, dedicated over 55's housing, a new school equipped to meet future needs, high quality council homes, new additional council homes to meet residents needs related to overcrowding, downsizing and affordable options for leaseholders to remain on the estate.

62. The supporting studies, namely the Equalities and Health Impact Assessment (EHIA) and Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) were also used to inform decision-making. The EHIA identifies positive opportunities from each option with option 5 having the most opportunities from on equalities and health. The CBA identifies Option 5 has the second highest Net Present Social Value over the lifetime of the programme after Option 4. It also finds that '*Options 3 – 5, which see a greater proportion of re-provided and/or new housing,*

have the greatest potential to positively impact quality of life on the estate.'

63. This option also meets with the aims of the low-rise programme to improve the quality of homes on the estate and build new homes where residents support this option. This option represents a balanced and reasonable approach to redevelopment on the estate to meet the interests of residents.

Policy implications

64. This report seeks a decision to proceed with the next stage of resident consultation on the Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild Programme. It does not seek a decision on new policy.

65. Option 5 supports the delivery of high quality homes and new council homes with support from residents and therefore aligns with the Council Plan, Housing Strategy and Great Estates programme which support the delivery of new council homes on council owned land and the Protocol for Consideration of New Homes, Charter of Principles.

66. Consultation at this stage and into the future is based on council commitments established in existing legislation and council policy as well as a Tustin Estate local lettings policy in line with the established policy whereby at least 50% of the properties will be offered to residents of the estate subject to their housing need. The options also commit to replacing all existing council homes and ensuring at least 50% of additional homes (those that go beyond replacing existing homes) will be council homes on council rents. As such there will be no loss of existing homes.

67. As Option 5 includes demolition and rebuild of homes, consultation will continue on the basis of estate regeneration based policies. These include the right to return, giving the ability for residents to continue to live on the estate and to keep the community together; home loss compensation and disturbance payments; a local lettings policy whereby at least 50% of the properties will be offered to residents on the estate subject to their housing need; dedicated rehousing support; ongoing engagement and consultation on the works programme for residents; businesses and the school.

68. Option 5 also includes demolition of businesses and the school. Consultation with these stakeholders will outline principles and commitments to these stakeholders.

69. Consultation with all stakeholders will apply New Local Plan and Old Kent Road Area Action Plan planning policies as well as Southwark New Homes Guidance including emerging environmental sustainability and climate change policies.

70. An Equalities and Health Impact Assessment (EHIA) has been completed by external consultants Mott McDonald with a baseline study to analyse the demographic profile of the site.

71. This report has been prepared to support a transparent and robust decision making process. It establishes the depth of community engagement on the future of their homes.
72. Where residents vote 'yes' in favour of the final option in the Resident Ballot, the final option will be funded from a blend of sources including GLA grant, Housing Revenue Funding (HRA) and borrowing and sales from private homes. Where residents vote 'no' against the final option in the Residents Ballot, the option to repair and maintain the state to a decent homes standard will be taken forward. This is Option 1 in the Ranking the Options Survey.

Community impact statement

73. Section 149 of the Equality Act, lays out the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) which requires public bodies to consider all individuals when carrying out their day to day work – in shaping policy, in delivering services and in relation to their own employees. It requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities. The council's [Approach to Equality](#) ("the approach") commits the council to ensuring that equality is an integral part of our day to day business.
74. Procurement of consultant services for the Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild has applied Fairer Future Procurement Strategy commitments to ensure Fairer Future Promises and the use of quality, cost and social value (where applicable) in tendering documents and evaluation.
75. The Equality and Health Impact Assessment (EHIA) can be found at Appendix 1. The EHIA was carried out independently by Mott Mc Donald. The EHIA focuses on the potential effects, including health effects, likely to be experienced by those living and working in the community in light of their 'protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010. It identifies any differential or disproportionate effects, both positive and negative, on those with protected characteristics from the programme and from the options and sets out mitigation or enhancement measures that the council can put in place. It looks at these factors ahead of confirming decisions and policy.
76. This report was produced having established the demographic baseline of the estate and with community engagement and analysis of the 'Starting the Conversation Questionnaire' which sought to understand resident's needs. The EHIA considers the design as well as the emerging council commitments to residents that have formed the basis of the programme and consultation.
77. The EHIA considers each option during the process of renewal as well as after the completion of works or renewal.

78. The next stage of the EHIA will consider the two options that will apply in the Residents Ballot, Option 1 and Option 5. The Stage 2 report will be produced with resident engagement. The findings of the report will be taken forward at the next stage and into the delivery of the outcome of the Resident Ballot.
79. Equality and health impact analysis demonstrates that the decision shows no potential for discrimination and the council has taken all appropriate opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people with different protected characteristics.
80. The Human Rights Act 1998 (“the 1998 Act”) incorporates into domestic law the European Convention on Human Rights.
81. In the Council’s view the first recommendation of this report engages certain human rights under the 1998 Act. The term ‘engage’ simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant matters for consideration.
82. In the case of the recommendation to redevelop the low-rise homes a number of rights are potentially engaged and the Council has given these matters due consideration, namely:
- Article 8: The right to respect for private and family life – the recommendation proposes to partially demolish and regenerate the Tustin Estate. This would lead to the re-provision of new homes and public realm, and the demolition of some homes; and
 - Article 1, Protocol 1: Protection of Property – Article 1 protects the right of individuals to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. No individual can be deprived of his/her possessions except in the public interest and subject to the relevant national and international law. The Council recognises the potential for interference with individuals’ right to peaceful enjoyment of existing and future homes upon the implementation of the recommendation, should that option be selected.
83. Notably, not all human rights operate in the same way. Few rights are absolute and thus cannot be interfered with under any circumstances. Other ‘qualified’ rights, including the aforementioned Article 8 and Protocol 1 rights, can lawfully be interfered with or limited in certain circumstances. The extent of legitimate interference is subject to the principle of proportionality whereby a balance must be struck between the legitimate aims to be achieved by a local authority in seeking to bring about regeneration in the public interest against potential interference with individual human rights. It is acceptable for the Council to strike a balance between the legitimate aim of regeneration for the benefit of the community as a whole, and the additional benefits of regeneration such as the new park and school, against potential interference with some individual rights where residents are re-housed, in some cases where they may not have supported the regeneration or voted for it in a ballot.

Resource implications

84. The cost of Option 1 will be financed from the Housing Revenue Funding (HRA). The cost of Option 5 will be financed from a blend of sources including GLA grant, Housing Revenue Funding (HRA) and borrowing and sales from private homes.
85. The estimated cost of Option 1 (the repair and maintain option) for homes over 30 years is a minimum of £32.7m excluding improvements, cyclical and responsive maintenance, professional fees, contractors preliminaries, and equality act adaptations. The estimated cost of refurbishment of the school over 30 years is £4.6m.
86. The estimated cost of Option 5 (redevelopment of the estate) is £165m. These costs allow for the replacement and refurbishment of all council homes, the replacement of leaseholder homes and the construction of an estimated 450 – 500 new homes with 50% of new additional homes will be council homes and 50% will be private for sale homes. These costs also include a new school built to meet future needs and new commercial units to replace those lost via demolition. It is anticipated that the redevelopment will attract grant funding of £32m and generate net receipts of £21.4m.
87. The cost of ongoing consultation has been included in the Tustin Estate Improvement and Rebuild feasibility budget approved by Housing Investment Board and financed from the Housing Revenue Account. The estimated costs of ongoing consultation do not exceed the feasibility budget.
88. Staffing of the ongoing consultation will not change and there are no implications for staffing as part of the ongoing consultation.

Consultation

89. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with residents on the estate since May 2019. Details of the consultation can be found between paragraphs 19 and 54.
90. Ongoing consultation will include consultation on design, environmental sustainability, equalities and health, financial and cost benefit appraisals of the options including council commitments.
91. Consultation and engagement will comply with local and government regulations and guidance on gatherings.
92. Consultation methods will include telephone calls, online meetings, newsletters, letters, use of dedicated website, production of a video and a landlord offer document. Consultation will continue with resident groups and individual residents as well as the school and business community.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Director of Law and Democracy

93. The report seeks approval to the next step in this process, namely to take forward option 5 as the preferred option which will be the subject of a ballot in spring 2021 following cabinet approval.
94. The report confirms that there has been extensive consultation with residents throughout the process, and sets out how the consultation process has been adapted following the Covid-19 pandemic. The report further confirms that the ballot, which will be the subject of a report to Cabinet in early 2021, will be conducted in accordance with the GLA's recommendations.
95. The report notes the council's duties under s149 of the Equality Act 2010 which requires the council in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to :
- a) eliminate discrimination;
 - b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
 - c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Relevant protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act are;

Age

Civil partnership

Disability

Gender reassignment

Pregnancy and maternity

Race

Religion or belief

Sex and sexual orientation

96. An Equalities and Health Impact Assessment has been commissioned in order to assist the council with its decision making having regard to its public sector equality duty. This is an ongoing obligation and the issues raised by the EHIA will continue to be monitored as the matter progresses.

Strategic Director of Finance and Governance

97. Following consultation with residents on the redevelopment of the Tustin estate, this report seeks approval from the Cabinet Member for Housing to take forward option 5 as the preferred option to put to a ballot in Spring 2021 subject to Cabinet approval in January 2021. Details of option 5 along with the default option (option 1) should the preferred option be rejected at ballot are set out in this report.

98. There are no financial implications arising directly from the recommendations made in this report. Indicative costs are set out in the resource implications section of the report, but both options are subject to a more detailed costing exercise and consideration of their affordability taking into account other programme commitments and resources available to fund them. As yet, there is no provision in the Housing Investment Programme for the redevelopment of the estate, nor in the General Fund capital programme for the re-provision of the school and on completion of the costing exercise, the options will be subject to Cabinet approval for inclusion in the respective capital programmes before being put to ballot.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
n/a		

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Equality and Health Impact Assessment
Appendix 2	Report on the Tustin Estate Whittling Down Test of Opinion
Appendix 3	Tustin Test of Opinion – Open Question Comments

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Mike Tyrrell, Director of Ledbury	
Report Author	Sophie Hall-Thompson, Regeneration Manager	
Version	Final	
Dated	18 November 2020	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included
Director of Law and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
Cabinet Member	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		18 November 2020