

Item No. 7.	Classification: Open	Date: 13 December 2011	Meeting Name: Cabinet
Report title:		Hawkstone Low-Rise Options Appraisal – Appendix (consultation feedback)	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Rotherhithe Ward	
Cabinet Member:		Councillors Fiona Colley, Regeneration and Corporate Strategy and Ian Wingfield, Deputy Leader and Housing Management	

APPENDIX – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

1. Hawkstone low-rise residents were provided with an information pack detailing the outcome of the preferred option and the implications of that option on 30 November. This information pack included a preferred option survey to fill in and return, an invitation to an open Hawkstone low-rise Resident Steering Group (hereafter referred to as the Hawkstone RSG) meeting on Wednesday 7 December to discuss the preferred option and an invitation to a preferred option drop-in session on Thursday 8 December (a copy of the pack appears at appendix one). Residents were also made aware of these events at a meeting of the Hawkstone Tenant and Resident Association on Thursday 1 December.

Preferred option survey

2. 48 low-rise residents responded to the preferred option consultation, representing a response rate of 41 per cent. There was a fairly even response across the low-rise blocks, with the fewest responses received from Jarman House. The breakdown by block is shown at table 1. For the purposes of the following analysis, the response from the sub-lettee has been discounted.

Table 1 – breakdown of responses by block

Block	Leaseholder	Tenant	Sublettee	Did not specify tenure	Total (%)
Canute Gardens	2	12		1	15 (31%)
Jarman House	3	5		1	9 (19%)
Rotherhithe Old Road	0	10			10 (21%)
Did not specify block	1	11	1	1	14 (29%)
Total	6	38	1	3	48

3. The response rate from leaseholders was particularly poor, with only 4% of leaseholders in the low-rise blocks responding to the consultation; 42% of tenants responded to the consultation.

4. Residents were asked if they were happy with the preferred option, the responses to which are detailed in table 2. 74% of respondents overall indicated that they are happy with the preferred option. If this response is broken down by tenure, however, it shows that 5 of the 6 respondents who identified themselves as leaseholders (83%) are not happy with the preferred option. Of the five negative responses, three leaseholders gave the high cost of refurbishment works as the reason for their response. The remaining two responses questioned how the preferred option had been identified. Excluding leaseholder responses, the positive response to the preferred option amongst tenants rises to 83%.

Table 2 - Responses to “Are you happy with the preferred option?”

Block	Tenure	Yes	No	Total
Canute Gardens	Tenant	10	2	12
	Leaseholder	1	1	2
	Did not specify	1	0	1
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>12 (80%)</i>	<i>3(20%)</i>	<i>15 (100%)</i>
Jarman House	Tenant	5	0	5
	Leaseholder	0	3	3
	Did not specify	1	0	1
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>6 (67%)</i>	<i>3 (33%)</i>	<i>9 (100%)</i>
Rotherhithe Old Road	Tenant	6	4	10
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>6 (60%)</i>	<i>4 (40%)</i>	<i>10 (100%)</i>
Did not specify block	Tenant	10	1	11
	Leaseholder	0	1	1
	Did not specify tenure	1	0	1
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>11 (85%)</i>	<i>2 (15%)</i>	<i>13 (100%)</i>
Total (%)		35 (74%)	12 (26%)	47 (100%)

5. The least positive response to the preferred option, by block, came from Rotherhithe Old Road, where 4 residents were not happy with the option. Of the four negative responses received from residents of Rotherhithe Old Road, one of the responses cited a desire to leave the area rather than stay; one cited dissatisfaction that kitchens were not included as part of the standard and one referred to the fact that ‘the chosen few seem to get everything, while others of us get nothing’.
6. Residents were also asked if the preferred option included all the works that were important to them. 68% of respondents said that it did, whilst 28% of respondents said that it did not. The breakdown of responses is shown in table 3. Of those respondents who felt that the preferred option did not include the works important to them, 4 respondents cited the lack of inclusion of replacement kitchens as their reason and 2 respondents cited that they would prefer to move.
7. Residents were also asked whether the implications of the preferred option were acceptable to them. The responses indicated that:
- 33% of respondents did not find it acceptable that kitchens would only be replaced where they were over 20 years old and deemed to be beyond their reasonable life (52% thought it acceptable)

- 29% of respondents did not find it acceptable that they may be required to vacate their homes for up to five hours if specialists advise that it is safer for some works to be done without residents in situ (56% thought it acceptable)
 - 83% of respondents thought it acceptable that the Hawkstone low-rise blocks be programmed into year 2012/13 of the Housing Investment Programme.
 - 60% of respondents found it acceptable that repairs needs would be reduced over the longer term as a result of investment in an enhanced refurbishment standard.
8. Finally, residents were asked to list their three top priorities for the estate. The three that received the greatest response were:
- Having the works done to my flat that are most important to me (39 of 47 survey respondents listed this in their top three)
 - Improving the condition and appearance of the low-rise blocks and their common parts (29 of 47 survey respondents listed this in their top three)
 - Improving the condition and appearance of the areas immediately external to the low rise blocks eg) repairing the communal refuse cupboards and communal stairwells (22 of 47 survey respondents listed this in their top three)
9. It should be noted that four out of the six leaseholders who responded to this question prioritised 'having a solution that is affordable to me'.

Table 3 – Response to ‘Does this option include the works that are important to you?’

Block	Tenure	Yes	No	No response	Total
Canute Gardens	Tenant	8	3	1	12
	Leaseholder	0	2	0	2
	Did not specify	0	1	0	1
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>8 (53%)</i>	<i>6 (40%)</i>	<i>1 (7%)</i>	<i>15 (100%)</i>
Jarman House	Tenant	4	1	0	5
	Leaseholder	1	2	0	3
	Did not specify	1	0	0	1
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>6 (67%)</i>	<i>3 (23%)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>9 (100%)</i>
Rotherhithe Old Road	Tenant	7	3	0	10
	<i>Subtotal (%)</i>	<i>7 (70%)</i>	<i>3 (30%)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>10 (100%)</i>
Did not specify block	Tenant	9	1	1	11
	Leaseholder	1	0	0	1
	Did not specify tenure	1	0	0	1
	<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>11 (86%)</i>	<i>1 (7%)</i>	<i>1(7%)</i>	<i>13</i>
Total (%)		32 (68%)	13 (28%)	2 (4%)	47

Open RSG meeting

10. The Hawkstone RSG met on Wednesday 7 December to discuss the preferred option. This meeting was not attended by any non-members of the Hawkstone RSG. The RSG noted that the preferred option consultation was underway and discussion centred around what the next steps would be for the start of

refurbishment works should Cabinet make a decision to implement the preferred option.

Drop-in session

11. Nineteen Hawkstone low-rise residents attended the preferred option drop-in session on Thursday 8 December. This included eight residents from Rotherhithe Old Road, seven residents from Jarman house and three residents from Canute Gardens. Four of the attendees were leaseholders. Leaseholders who attended this event expressed strong concern over the cost of the refurbishment proposed as the preferred option. There was a general dissatisfaction with the value for money provided by works that they had previously been re-charged for. A number of queries were raised around the reliability of the costing of the various elements of work that comprised the budget estimates.
12. A number of residents from Rotherhithe Old Road expressed concern that the preferred option would not be sufficient to redress the transmission of noise from the main road into their homes and indicated that they would want to explore the potential to use more noise resistant materials in the works specifications for their homes than had been modelled as part of the options appraisal.

The options appraisal consultation process

13. Concerns over the approach to consultation undertaken as part of the options appraisal have been expressed.
14. The consultation process surrounding the options appraisal has been intensive in order to keep to the deadlines outlined in the Cabinet report of October 2011, which noted significant slip in the timescales that officers were initially working to. The communications sent to residents and open events that have been held for residents of the Hawkstone low-rise blocks and also high rise blocks since the October cabinet report are listed below for Cabinet members' information:
 - 26 October – Outline of the draft options to be appraised presented at an open meeting of the Hawkstone Tenant and Resident Association.
 - 3 November – Hawkstone options appraisal open day for tenants and leaseholders of the Hawkstone low-rise blocks and high-rise blocks.
 - 14 November – Leaflets provided to residents of the Hawkstone low-rise and high-rise blocks summarising the feedback received at the 3rd November drop-in session and publicising a drop-in session for those with further questions on 21st November.
 - 21 November – Drop in session to feedback on the comments received at the 3rd November options appraisal open day.
 - Week commencing 21st November – mail out of remainder of Hawkstone low-rise RSG minutes to Hawkstone low-rise residents, with one set discussing issues that affect high-rise residents sent to high-rise residents.
 - 30 November – Hawkstone low-rise residents receive the information pack provided at appendix one of this report, including a preferred option survey for them to fill in.
 - Week commencing 5 December – the Hawkstone low-rise independent resident advisor undertakes door-knocking to provide assistance to any residents who have questions about the preferred option survey.

- 1 December – The preferred option is explained at an open meeting of the Hawkstone TRA with officers on hand to answer any questions received. Hawkstone high-rise residents are written to informing them of the preferred option, explaining that it will not include either infill development on the estate or redevelopment of the estate
- 7 December – An open meeting of the Hawkstone low-rise RSG is held.
- 8 December – A preferred option drop-in session for Hawkstone low-rise residents is held for residents to ask any questions about the preferred option and provide any feedback they may have.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICER

Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance

15. The supplementary appendix sets out the details and the outcome of consultation with affected low rise residents on the recommended option that took place in early December. It also summarises previous consultation with residents referred in the body of the report. Cabinet members are referred to the advice of the Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance set out in the report; the statutory requirement to consult is engaged where in the opinion of the landlord council a matter of housing management is likely to substantially affect secure tenants as a whole or a group of them. In the opinion of officers, the preferred option recommended to cabinet is only likely to affect the group of residents in low rise accommodation on the Hawkstone estate with whom consultation has taken place. Members are reminded that they should give careful consideration to the consultation responses when taking a decision on the recommendation in the report.

AUDIT TRAIL

Cabinet Member	Councillors Fiona Colley, Regeneration and Corporate Strategy and Ian Wingfield, Deputy Leader and Housing Management	
Lead Officer	Maurice Soden, Regeneration Initiatives Manager	
Report Author	Jennifer Daothong, Project Officer (Estate Regeneration)	
Version	Final	
Dated	13 December 2011	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBERS		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	Yes	Yes
Finance Director	Yes	Yes
Head of Home Ownership	Yes	Yes
Cabinet Members	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	13 December 2011	