

Wokingham Borough Council

Gorse Ride Project Residents Steering Group

Wednesday 7th February 2018 - 7pm to 9pm
St Mary's and St John's Parish Centre
Meeting Notes

Residents / Stakeholder Attendees:

Steve Bowers	(SB)	Dart Close Resident / Tenant / Finchampstead Parish Councillor
Claire McEnoy	(CM)	Meeting Vice Chair / Firs Close Resident / Tenant
Chris Wallace	(CW)	Gorse Ride South Resident
Annette Lenton	(AL)	Billing Ave Resident / Tenant
Kerry Player	(KP)	Billing Ave Resident / Gorse Ride School
Harry Row	(HR)	Church volunteer, Nine Mile Ride / Gorse Ride School governor
Ian Pittock	(IP)	Ward Councillor for Finchampstead South
Doug Bates	(DB)	Dart Close Resident / Homeowner
Mike Jones	(MJ)	Orbit Close Resident / Homeowner
Zaheer Sheikh	(ZS)	Billing Ave Resident / Homeowner
Nicola Bell	(NB)	Dart Close Resident / Homeowner
Matt Sales	(MS)	Whittle Close Resident / Homeowner
Jade Morgan-Jones	(JMG)	Orbit Close Resident / Tenant
Angie Woods	(AG)	Gorse Ride South Resident / Tenant
Mel Marriot	(MM)	Firs Close Resident
Dan Marriot	(DM)	Firs Close Resident
David Bolam	(DB)	Firs Close Resident / Homeowner
Barbara Wojna	(BW)	Nine Mile Ride School Governor
Steve Bromley	(SBr)	Ratepayers Hall, California Association, 175 Nine Mile Ride
Richard Dolinski	(RD)	WBC Executive Member for Adult Services
Roland Cundy	(RC)	Finchampstead Parish Councillor
Richard Rampton	(RR)	Finchampstead Parish Councillor
Andy Croy	(AC)	WBC Councillor and Gorse Ride ex resident

WBC / WBC representative Attendees

Louise Strongitharm	(LS)	Category Manager, Economic Prosperity and Place / Senior Manager for the Gorse Ride Project
Zareena Ahmed-Shere	(ZAS)	Senior Specialist (Estate Regeneration) / Gorse Ride Project Manager
Simon Price	(SP)	Housing Operation Manager
Jennie Grieve	(JGr)	Community Development Worker
Matthew Viccars	(MV)	Housing Officer (Neighbourhoods)
Marc Austin	(MA)	Ayre, Chamberlain, Gaunt (ACG) Architects
Marie Price	(MP)	Ayre, Chamberlain, Gaunt (ACG) Architects
Jonathan Walton	(JW)	Vocalism (ACG's design team)

Apologies

Jim Gallagher (JG) FBC Centre

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
1	Welcome and Introductions	
1.1	SB welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded everyone to read paperwork before attending.	
1.2	Meeting attendees briefly introduced themselves and gave an overview of their role / contribution to the Group as recorded above.	

2 Actions from the Previous Meeting / Action Tracker

- 2.1 There were no changes made to the 6th December meeting minutes. ZAS stated that the minutes from the Extra Special Tenancy Issues Meeting held on 24th January will be sent to everyone who attended plus all steering group members. **ZAS**
- 2.2 ZAS reminded everyone that at the previous meeting it had been agreed that the either a Parish or WBC Executive / Ward Councillor can make up the Meeting Quorum.
- 2.3 ZAS went through the action tracker. The following matters were highlighted.
- Communication
WBC Officers are disseminating project information through uploading documents on the WBC Gorse Ride web page, Steering Group, Regeneration Surgeries, Community Newsletters and project mailing lists however we rely on Steering Group attendees to share information with neighbours / wider community and feedback their views. **ALL**
 - Delivering Steering Group Documents
ZAS met with the Chair and Vice Chair where it was acknowledged that up to date project information might not be getting through to everyone living on the estate. To be more transparent we need do more to ensure that everyone potentially affected by these proposals is receiving Steering Group information. It was suggested that one person per road should be appointed as the Steering Group representative who can feedback Steering Group information to neighbours on their street. ZAS will package the current information that has been issued to the Steering Group into envelopes so the designated person is able to hand deliver (through the letter box) to residents in their road. Volunteers would be welcome and should contact ZAS. **ALL**
 - Steering Group Meeting Papers
As requested ZAS will aim to send out Steering Group Meeting papers on a Friday before the next SG meeting, which will be 3 days ahead of the meeting. **ZAS**
 - Letter to Council Tenants
Following the Tenancy Issues meeting on the 24th January which fed back a summary of the legal advice, the Council will be writing to all tenants shortly with this information and seek their views. The Tenant & Landlord Improvement Panel (TLIP) – Communications Group reviewed the draft letter for Plain English to make it accessible. LS thanked CW (who chairs this group) and its other members for their help. MJ requested the letter to go to homeowners too. CM stated that it was agreed that letters to all residents (seeking views) would go out before an Executive decision is made. **ZAS**
 - Youth Consultation
Meeting with Jim and FBC to agree form of consultation with youth groups Kickex and Explode has been pushed back until the Masterplan has been formed. This is to be arranged by the end of the month. DB, who represents a local scout's group would like to be involved in that discussion. **ZAS**
 - Phase 1 Pre App Proposals – Parking Provision and Standards Applied
This information is set out in the action tracker.
 - Feedback from visit to Groveland and Phoenix Avenues (WHL's recently completed housing developments)
Those who took part in the visit completed a feedback form. Their comments have put together in a document and has been circulated to Steering Group members.
In response to requests, ZAS had asked WHL to provide floorplans for the

properties viewed. It was noted that the planning applications will be on line so the floorplans can be viewed there. ZAS will provide reference numbers for people to view.

ZAS

- Feedback on the 3 Draft Development Options

A document summarising the responses was put together and circulated to Steering Group members.

3 Note and approve the updated Terms of Reference for the Group

- 3.1 SB asked ZAS to highlight what has been updated. ZAS informed the Group that the draft documents was updated to read that 1 WBC Councillor or Finchampstead Parish Council could make up the meeting Quorum. The Group were happy with the document. These documents are now the agreed Terms of Reference.

4 Note and approve Role of Chair and Vice Chair

- 4.1 SB asked the Group if everyone was happy with the proposed role of the Chair and Vice Chair. This document was agreed and is to be attached to the Terms of Reference.

ZAS

5 Phase 1 (Arnett Ave) progress

- 5.1 The Phase 1 draft Pre-Application Planning drawings were presented to the Steering Group meeting in December. These drawings have been submitted to the Planning Department for informal advice. Initial Pre Application advice has been received and a follow up meeting with Planning Officers will be held next week where more detailed advice will be provided.

- 5.2 In light of the final advice received, the drawings will be refined to form a Planning Application. Before the Planning Application is formally submitted, a public consultation event will be held so residents and stakeholders can view the revised plans.

LS / ZAS

- 5.3 WHL have informally applied for a Prior Approval Notice to request permission to carry out demolition works. A letter has gone out to homes that surround the Phase 1 area to inform them that this is happening and that they will receive formal notification from the Council in due course. The letter also advises residents that as properties within the Phase 1 boundary become empty, WHL will be hoarding off areas to secure the site.

- 5.4 MS enquired whether Phase 1 was on schedule. LS stated that it is on schedule. The aim is to get the Planning Application submitted and start demolition in May. The building work will start once the site is cleared and is estimated to complete around early 2020.

- 5.5 There was a comment that a family had recently moved into one of the decanted bungalows. SP confirmed that this is true but no further homes in phase 1 will be used as temporary accommodation. LS added that the priority was to demolish buildings as soon as they become empty so avoid likelihood of anti-social behaviour.

6 Phase 2 + Presentation on Masterplan Formation

- 6.1 ACG has produced 4 Presentation Boards that illustrated how the Masterplan Plan and associated Phasing Plan had been formed. Some hard paper copies of the

masterplan were available at the meeting. MA, JW and MP talked through it.

6.2 MA explained that the Masterplan was developed following previous feedback. It is a guide on how the estate could be re-developed. It is not final and if required can be tweaked to reflect changing circumstances at a later stage in the project.

6.3 JW added that the Masterplan has sought to achieve a balance between what people want against what would need to be given up to deliver a viable scheme. In response to the feedback, 30 homes with garages have now been included and bungalows too but all these additional features have taken up space so ultimately a collective community decision has to be made on what space (ie density of housing, green space, parking etc) to sacrifice.

6.4 Board 1 – Masterplan image

6.4.1 The Masterplan features a large village green with clusters of trees as a central 'spine'. Homes are arranged around this and along key views and routes into this green space.

6.4.2 Broadly, higher density housing (apartments) is focused around the large green space and lower density semi-detached houses and bungalows are at the periphery.

6.4.3 DB asked whether this meant that flats did not have gardens. MA and LS replied that they would have usable balconies and flat residents can use the surrounding green amenity areas.

6.4.4 AC commented that this is being called a "village green" but public spaces do not belong to anyone, many green spaces are overlooked but it does not change what can go on there. He raised concerns that this sort of space may attract antisocial activities. SP stated that there would be further consultation on the design as the project moves forward. It will ultimately be a community facility and the community need to own / control this space and take necessary measures to safeguard against antisocial behaviour occurring.

6.4.5 CW commented that the board was misleading. JW clarified that the Board she is referring to shows the original preferred draft Option which has now been superseded – the current Masterplan has added the bungalows.

6.4.6 MP explained that the flats have balconies to maximise views onto the village green and where possible achieve dual aspect. They have been orientated to maximise sunlight on roofs for solar panels.

6.4.7 There is a main pedestrian link from north to south through the Village Green. The shared surfaces and paths create a safe environment for pedestrians and provide linkages to the main external estate roads and local facilities.

6.4.8 The Village Green incorporates landscaped basins that will hold water in storms. This feature and green roofs (on blocks of flats) are designed to improve the surface water drainage in the event of heavy rainfall. It was clarified that the landscaped basins are classified as dry ponds, so will not routinely contain a body of stagnant water. They are useful as they are capable of holding water during a storm and reducing the likelihood of flooding, whilst still providing usable open space.

6.4.9 The community feedback highlighted that parking provision was very important. The parking standards have been increased so that there is a minimum of 1 space per flat and 2 spaces per house and in addition on street visitor parking spaces. IP asked if the parking was allocated to flats. MP stated that the parking is not

defined. CW asked if there is disabled parking. MP replied that it not included at this masterplan stage, but it will be a requirement. JW summed up that there is provision over and above the Council's current parking standards. In addition we have provided 30 garages (which have not been included as spaces in the calculation) so there are more parking spaces than most standard new builds.

- 6.4.10 SP noted that we should reflect on the history of Gorse Ride. The current garages are in a poor state of repair. Some of them have been knocked down and the space has been cleared to provide parking. This has been well received. Garages are land hungry so it makes sense to provide only a small number in the new development.
- 6.4.11 MJ asked about charging points. JW replied that this is detail around sustainability, which will be picked up when the project progresses to the next stages.
- 6.4.12 In response to a question, JW confirmed that the road width will allow for cars to be parked on one side and pass. The single pass approach is also designed to slow down the speed of vehicles.

6.5 Board 2 – Masterplan Development / Provisions

- 6.5.1 The Masterplan replaces 178 existing homes with 243 new homes.
- 6.5.2 The parking spaces have increased from the original option drawings.
- 6.5.3 Bungalows have been introduced. The Masterplan contains 11 x 1 bed / 2 person and 2 x 2 bed / 4 person bungalows
- 6.5.4 IP commented that more bungalows could be accommodated if we removed the garages. CM observed that there is a lot of green space, perhaps this may be reduced to create space to fit more bungalows?
- 6.5.5 MA noted that there was scope to densify some areas. MP advised that bearing in mind the number of new homes being provided the recommendation is to provide 1 hectare of open space. The open space allows some of the mature trees to be retained and integrated into the new development. As well as being aesthetically pleasing, the open spaces serve a useful purpose, including flood attenuation.
- 6.5.6 MP continued that small rows of terraced housing were also introduced so that some bungalows could be accommodated. The Masterplan now has a wider range of housing types and garden lengths.
- 6.5.7 JM questioned why the bungalows had long gardens and whether this was needed. Most old people do not necessarily want a large garden to maintain. AL observed that even though some people cannot cope they still do like their gardens. CW remarked that it will not make a difference as there is only 14 to choose from. SB pointed out that people who do not wish to have a garden could opt to be rehoused in a ground floor flat. MP advised that it was better to start off with long gardens now and decide to lose it later on. LS asked if the flats will have lifts. Generally if flats are 4 storey and above they will have lifts, however for the Masterplan the design team have not gone into this level of detail.
- 6.5.8 CW observed that there are not enough 2 bed houses. One third of residents would be expected to go into flats. She expected to see more 2 bed houses. MP informed the Group that the flats and the houses are almost the same size. AL asked whether the Council knew what the household needs were. LS said that the Council did an analysis of the data held by the housing team on current profile of households / occupiers. The housing types shown in the Masterplan reflects

current household need. LS acknowledged that the demographics / profile of residents needs will change overtime but it was important to start somewhere. SB remarked that only in the last few weeks 4 homes were vacated so change does happen and we have to be flexible and move with that.

- 6.5.9** There was discussion around whether building for existing residents would be futureproof. SP stated that we are building homes for the long term future – it is not about the here and now. The baseline information was a snapshot of the present so we can plan for the future generations. IP summed up that more 2 bed houses would probably be needed as it makes sense to accommodate households with kids in houses rather than flats so they can run around without too much disturbance. One way to fit more in may be to get rid of the garages.
- 6.5.10** RD added that garages were a luxury. JM stated that some people do need their garages and homeowners use them too. MJ added that he uses his. IP asked whether the garages should just be provided for the homeowners. LS advised that the request for garages has mostly come from the homeowners and we have responded to this in the Masterplan. This is a long term project and this is a starting point. Phase 1 (Arnett Avenue) will include 2 bed houses so there will be an opportunity for people from this estate to move into them.
- 6.5.11** MP advised that the Masterplan boundary has changed. The 4 traditional brick built bungalows at Vicarage Close have been removed from the scope of this project and will be retained.
- 6.5.12** MP also advised that ACG's Utilities consultant has recommended to include sub stations within the boundary of the apartment blocks so they take up less room.

6.6 Board 3 – Character and Landscape Plan

- 6.6.1** These drawings show the relationship between green amenity spaces and the homes.
- 6.6.2** JM asked how the estate road fits – it changes colour but appears to go all the way around the outer part of the estate which is what most people did not want. MP advised that surface materials of estate roads do change to create primary and secondary routs, but there will be access. JM highlighted concern that there will still be people dropping off school kids. JW said that measures that can be put in place to stop the rat runs. These details can be added later.
- 6.6.3** RC asked how these houses (terraced) would access the rear gardens as paths for access are usually dumped with rubbish. JW clarified that the access is only for 2 owners and/or there would be individual, locked gated paths. The aim has been to remove the network of back alleyways that may continue to give rise to this problem.

6.7 Board 4 – phasing

- 6.7.1** The proposal is for the delivery of the Masterplan over an 88 month period in 3 phases. It is not possible to relocate everyone in one go. The Masterplan and indicative phasing plan has been produced to inform project costs and give the Council an idea of potential duration of the project. The plan takes into account the need for contractors to provide residents access 24hrs a day. If the project goes ahead, the delivery team will carry out further consultation with residents. Childrens needs will also be taken into account. There are a number of challenges that would need to be overcome in order to minimize disruption. The plan is not fixed but works with contractors. Its purpose is to give an idea of the timeframe.
- 6.7.2** The approach is to start construction from the innermost part of the site to the outer

part of the site. The priority is to provide the bulk of the green amenity space upfront. This will also establish north to south pedestrian routes, the landscaped basins that would capture surface water during heavy rainfall early in the development programme

- 6.7.3** IP asked whether development contractors will put in place the utilities too, otherwise there is a risk of delays as has happened in the town centre. MA replied that we do not know yet, it depends on who is procured to carry out the development, but whatever happens developers have to rely on co-operation from utility companies.
- 6.7.4** CW enquired whether there is any additional access to Phase 1 and 2 other than Billing Ave and Gorse Ride South. MA replied that there is no vehicular access. The Masterplan does not propose opening up additional routes elsewhere on the estate. CW commented that the residents at the corner of Billing Ave and Gorse Ride South have potentially 10yrs of traffic going past their door.
- 6.7.5** DB enquired about which sub station feeds which phases. MA responded that the design team did not at this point have this information but their utility consultant is currently looking into this. It is known however that the substations on site are also feeding power outside the project boundary
- 6.7.6.** JW advised that the timing of phasing is conservative and it could possibly be done quicker.
- 6.7.7** HR observed that the phasing could be difficult for various reasons, especially movement of people and vehicles. Construction traffic routes and routes for children to get to and from school need to be planned and agreed.
- 6.8** The Design Team asked if there were any questions on the Masterplan development.
- 6.9** IP asked if different modern construction techniques are being considered rather than building with bricks. LS responded that although there have been advances in modern methods of construction, we are not necessarily inclined towards replacing these homes with this type of build given the history on the estate (which itself was considered a modern construction technique). JW pointed out that techniques have vastly improved since Gorse Ride was built.
- 6.10** AC asked whether all new roads will have pavements. There would be a mix, some will have pavements (primary routes) and some will be shared surfaces. A comment was also made that it appears that the house frontages are positioned very close to the pavement, which creates a hostile environment. However positioning the houses in this way has allowed for long gardens to give people a sense of space. MA said that he had noticed that many people tend to park their cars on their front gardens. MJ said a compromise would be needed if you want car parking at the front. JW agreed that it is all about balance to achieve something you collectively feel is important, you need to give something up. AC raised concerns that shared surfaces would put older people, those with impaired vision, kids, etc at risk and therefore is not a good idea. SB said that the Group have already discussed this at previous meetings.
- 6.11** SB advised the Group that if anyone would like to make further comments on what has been presented please go to the Regeneration Surgeries that are being held regularly at Community House to add to this consultation. RD cautioned that there will have to be a point where the line will have to be drawn.
- 6.12** MS observed that at this point there is good opportunity to feed information to neighbours and get to know them.

- 6.13** LS informed the Group that ACG were commissioned to carry out the feasibility and Masterplanning work, which is now concluded. This work will be reported to the Executive who will decide on the future of the Gorse Ride Estate. If the Executive decide to take the project further then they will make a decision to commit the necessary funds to deliver the Masterplan. We are looking to hold a public meeting in May and it would be good if ACG were able to attend.
- 6.14** AC asked if the public meeting is to be held before or after the Executive decision. LS replied that we previously said that we will be reporting to the Executive in March. This has been pushed back to a special meeting on 16th May as to get to the 29th March Executive, we needed to have completed the consultation with tenants by now. The formal consultation is to start this week.
- 6.15** The Tenant and Landlord Improvement Panel (TLIP) – Comms Group have been helping by reviewing the draft correspondence for plain English to make the information accessible for tenants. Thanks to their input, the letter and supporting documents are almost ready to be sent out to tenants.
- 6.16** The Council also wants to hear the views of homeowners on the possible suggested options, so we will be writing to them too.
- 6.17** The responses of both tenants and homeowners will be considered and reported to the Executive. As a result, it will not be possible to make the target date of 29th March. Unfortunately we go into the election purdah period, so the Executive cannot make a decision in April. The report is now due to be decided on 16th May 2018 by the Executive at an Extraordinary Special Meeting dedicated to Gorse Ride Regeneration. Residents will be able to go to the meeting.
- 6.18** AC stated that Executive meetings usually are structured therefore it would not be possible to have a dialogue. Will it be different this time? RD replied that there will be a debate and formal question time as normal and an opportunity for people to observe the decision making process. AC asked what level of detail will be presented to the Executive. LS replied that very high level information will be presented on project costs, the proposed funding model and tenancy arrangements etc.
- 6.19** LS informed the Group that at the last meeting on 24th January, holding a public meeting ahead of the Executive decision was suggested by the Council. However the message from residents was very clear that people want certainty. CM emphasized that residents do not want to hear about what is proposed but what has been decided and the process going forward. In view of this, instead of holding the public meeting before the decision, Council will be writing to all residents within the Phase 2 + area ahead of the Executive meeting enclosing a copy of the report, so that those potentially affected are aware what the Executive is being asked to approve. A public meeting in the form of an all-day drop in session will be held after the Executive decision is made.
- 6.20** MS said that residents want the letters on their options now and not in April. LS confirmed that residents should receive the letters on the proposals and possible options by the end of the week.
- 6.21** SBr suggested that the Public Meeting after the Executive decision is held w/c 28th May at the Ratepayers Hall. This will be fixed subject to staff availability.

ZAS

7 Update on Extra Special Meeting on Tenancy Issues

- 7.1** LS explained that the Council has a statutory duty to consult when a change is proposed to existing tenancy arrangements. The Council will send out a letter to all potentially affected tenants this week. Enclosed with the letter there will be a comparison table setting out the current tenants' rights and provisions under a Secure tenancy with the Council and the rights and provisions that could be provided under various alternative end Landlords post regeneration (i.e. external Housing Associations, Loddon Homes and Berry Brook Homes). A survey is also included in the correspondence. Residents are invited to complete and return these surveys to feed back their views on the proposed regeneration plans and the possible re-housing options. There will be two Regeneration Surgeries (one in the evening) before the closing date where residents can drop in if they have any questions or need any help completing the survey. It is easier for processing purposes to complete the surveys on line but you can complete paper forms if you prefer.
- 7.2** DB asked for confirmation on the Council's position on succession of tenancies if a spouse dies or if both die and you have adult children. SP advised legislation is changing all the time. The usual Council policy / existing tenancy terms and conditions will apply. An assessment of individual circumstances and the terms of the existing tenancy agreement will determine whether the tenancy can be inherited, or a new tenancy can be taken up elsewhere or if there are no rights at all.

8 Homeowners options

- 8.1** LS advised that the key message that have been fed back to us was that the majority of homeowners want to stay on the estate. ACG were therefore instructed to provide similar sized homes for homeowners within the Masterplan. There is an issue regarding values that needs to be addressed as the existing homes on the estate are worth less than homes around the Borough. This could limit the choice for homeowners if they wanted to move off the estate. The new build homes will be larger due to current space standards, some are semi-detached and it is likely that all new homes will have a higher value. A 3 bed house may typically be in the region of £350 - 400K.
- 8.2** We want to balance keeping the community together and making a good use of public purse. AC asked whether the funding was coming from Central Government. SP replied no, and explained that the project will be part funded by the money the Council receives from developers (Borough wide) in the form of commuted sums for providing affordable housing off site. Some of the funding will come from Council borrowing. LS stated that we would be seeking to attract Government grant into the project if possible. RD pointed out that it is still coming from the public sector.
- 8.3** CW asked whether the fact that homes privately owned on the estate are being devalued due to uncertainty is being taken into account. LS responded that there is a legal duty to value the homes based on a no scheme world using comparables in the area. SP added that the Council has over a number of years been buying back properties on the estate which have been steadily increasing in value.
- 8.4** LS continued that further down the line, we will need to meet individually with each homeowner to discuss what suits them as household circumstances vary.
- 8.5.** LS went through the 3 suggested options for homeowners if the redevelopment went ahead.

8.6 Option 1 – Equity Share (or Zero Rent Shared Ownership)

- 8.6.1** Under this option, homeowners would be able to swap the value of their existing home plus home loss payment into a newly built home with the same number of bedrooms or fewer on the estate. The homeowner would own the relevant percentage share in their new home and the Council or housing provider would own the remaining share or the gap in value. No interest or rent would be payable on the part owned by the Council or housing provider.
- 8.6.2** IP asked about who would be responsible for improvements and maintenance at this case – homeowner or Council / Housing Provider. LS responded that we do not have this level of detail yet. SP advised that within the Borough on Shared Ownership schemes the maintenance falls to the shared owner and not the Council / Housing Provider. CW asked what is the position regarding insurance. SP responded that this sits with the Council / Housing Provider for our shared ownership homes. RC commented that surely there should be a 80/20 split
- 8.6.3** LS highlighted that homeowners would have an opportunity under this option of moving into an equivalent sized property within the estate, with no additional expense. In future they would also have an option to buy out the share from the Council / Housing Provider. At the moment, it is proposed that this option is only open to resident homeowners only and not buy to let homeowners. We are asking people in the homeowners' consultation for their views on this.

8.7 Option 2 – Outright Purchase

- 8.7.1** Under this option homeowners would be able to swap the value of their existing home plus loss payment into a newly built home and then make an additional lump sum payment (to bridge the value gap), so that they will own the new home outright (100%).
- 8.7.2** MS observed that a 3 bed house on the estate is approx. £250K at the moment and the new 3 bed homes are likely to be around £350k so this would require a lump sum of approx. £100k.
- 8.7.3** CW asked how a CPO would affect this. LS replied that the Council will try to have discussions with all homeowners to reach a two way agreement so that a CPO can be avoided. SP added that CPO is the very last resort. He has been involved with CPO in other areas and the outcome has not been positive for both parties.

8.8 Option 3 – Sell to the Council or Housing Provider

- 8.8.1** This option would suit homeowners if they wished to move away or did not want to live in a home on the newly built estate. The Council or Housing Provider would buy the home at its market value. Home loss payment would also be made. They would then make their own new housing arrangements.
- 8.8.2** This option would be open to both resident and non-resident homeowners.
- 8.8.3** AL asked what would happen to private tenants living on the estate who make up the community and want to remain here. Will they too go on the Council's priority rehousing list? SP responded that we will need to look at possible housing options but ultimately they are in the private sector with very little security of tenure.
- 8.8.4** In addition to home loss payment, homeowners will receive payment for reasonable moving costs.
- 8.8.5** MS asked if it was correct that the only proposed option for Buy to Let investors is to sell to the Council / Housing Provider. LS confirmed that this was correct.

8.9 In terms of next steps, the Council will be writing to all the homeowners at the same time as the tenants, with a similar questionnaire.

8.10 AL asked whether the tenants in the privately owned homes are to be given any rights. AC observed that a private landlord would be likely to increase private rents. SP pointed out that ultimately a private landlord can legally give their tenants a month's notice to vacate. AL raised concern that there are only a few private tenants and it is unfair that they will be displaced from the community. JM commented that it will be up to the individuals to work with their landlords.

8.11 One Firs Close resident stated that they wish to stay on the estate and asked how this would happen. LS said that Firs Close is currently identified in the first phase of the Phase 2 + project, so existing Firs Close residents would have an opportunity move to into a new home completed on the Phase 1 (Arnett Ave site). The Council will aim to move people once only but temporary moves may have to be done if the type of home needed is not ready at that point. The Council will cover reasonable costs of each move. We will talk individually to all owners after the decision has been made in May.

9 Update on Site Visit to Phoenix and Grovelands

9.1 ZAS gave an update on feedback from the site visit to WHL recently completed housing developments (3 bed and 2 bed house respectively) at Phoenix and Grovelands Avenues. The comments made were summarized in a document circulated to the Group.

ZAS/SP

9.2 CW asked if some of the tenants could speak to the new residents at Phoenix. SP replied that we would try to facilitate this.

9.3 IP commented that the reason for the small size of the family bathroom and master bedroom was because the children's bedrooms were slightly larger. This is due to the "Closing the Gap" policy. Children from poor families are doing their homework in the lounge. A larger bedroom would mean they could retire to their bedroom to do their homework. RD added that the reason for the larger ground floor toilet at Phoenix is so that you could fit a shower in it in the future.

10. Next steps – Executive Decision:

10.1 This item was covered earlier in the meeting.

11. Any other Business

11.1 ZAS asked if anyone has not done so already to sign the attendance sheet with their details.

11.2 NB commented that it was good that the fallen trees had been removed from Dart Close.

11.3 CM asked when Phase 2 + is likely to start. LS estimated this to be around Spring 2020 on the basis that Phase 1 (Arnett Ave) needs to be completed first so people from Phase 2 + can move into those homes. KP observed that if a resident in the current Phase 1 area (of the Phase 2+ project) wanted to move into a new house in Phase 3 they would effectively be waiting in temporary accommodation for up to 7 years. SP agreed that this would be the case but there may be alternatives.

11.4 SB advised the Group that LS/ZAS will look at dates for the next meeting and

inform everyone when it is confirmed. It is likely to be sometime in March when we will have the results of the residents' (tenants and homeowners) survey .

Post Meeting Update:

- **An evening Regeneration Surgery (drop in session) will be held at the Community House, 17 Billing Avenue on Monday 5th March between 5:30pm and 7pm.**
- **An Extra Special Steering Group Meeting focusing on Homeowners options will held on Monday 5th March at 7:30pm**
- **The next regular Steering Group Meeting will be held on Wednesday 28th March at 7pm**

A Public Meeting (drop in event post Executive decision) will take place week commencing 21st May between 11am and 4pm (date to be confirmed).

All of the above meetings will take place at St Mary's and St John's Parish Centre, Vicarage Close.