

# Appendix 1: Broadwater Farm – Stapleford North consultation report summary

## 1. Introduction

Following the decision to consult with the residents of Stapleford North (flats 25-36 and 61-72) on the Broadwater Farm estate, the consultation commenced on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2021 and closed on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2021. For secure council tenants, this was a Section 105 consultation under the Housing Act 1985.

The consultation presented residents with two options:

- 1) To refurbish the homes in Stapleford North and work with residents throughout the works to minimise disruption.
- 2) To demolish the Stapleford North block and rehouse current residents, with a Right to Return to the estate once the new homes are built.

In addition to this, residents were notified that a third option would be for the block to be refurbished with a full decant for the duration of the works to the block and on the Northolt side. This option was not formally put forward due to the council taking the view that being rehoused for (up to) three and a half years for refurbishment was overly disruptive compared to the benefits to residents. Residents were also encouraged to notify us if there was an option we hadn't considered that they would like us to.

The block consists of 24-households and of these, 23 were occupied with 4 leaseholders, 17 secure council tenants, and 2 unauthorised occupants. One property was unoccupied.

## 2. Consultation and engagement approach

### Initial Engagement

On 18<sup>th</sup> June 2021, officers wrote to the residents of Stapleford North informing them that, subject to Cabinet approval, a consultation would be taking place. This letter also set out:

- Why the consultation was taking place.
- What the two proposed options were.
- Details of the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor (ITLA).
- Details of the Broadwater Farm Engagement Officer to contact with any questions.

Following the delivery of this letter, the rehousing team undertook outreach phone calls and door-knocking with residents during the week commencing 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021. This took place to ensure residents were able to express any concerns or ask any questions prior to the consultation opening, as officers were aware that residents would want more information than could be provided in the original letter. During this engagement, officers were able to speak to residents from 17 out of the 21 households that we wished to consult with. This early engagement also enabled officers to identify where residents had additional needs that needed to be reflected in the Equality Impact Assessment and to ensure that the consultation was accessible for all affected residents.

Cabinet approval was given on 13 July 2021 to proceed to formal consultation and the final consultation materials were drafted and approved ahead of the 26<sup>th</sup> July opening date.

### Methods

A range of methods to encourage all eligible residents to take part in the consultation. This included:

- Sending a pack to each household that contained a covering letter from the lead member, the consultation booklet outlining the two options, the consultation questionnaire, and a free-post returns envelope.
- Making the consultation available online on the council's website.
- Giving residents the contact details of the Broadwater Farm engagement officer to call or email with feedback.
- Outreach door-knocking and phone calls to remind residents to participate and answer any questions.
- A reminder post-card two weeks before the closing date to re-iterate the above and remind people of the contact details for the ITLA.

To ensure all residents could equally access and participate in the consultation, the letter and each pack contained a 'translation panel' enabling residents to request the material in a different language. The packs were also available in large print and braille upon request.

### 3. Responses to the consultation

By 26<sup>th</sup> August 2021, the council had received responses from 21 of the 21 eligible households in the block. Of these responses, 13 were in favour of option 2 and 8 were in favour of option 1.

The number of responses is broken down below by household type:

	Secure tenants	Resident Leaseholders	Non-resident leaseholders
Number of responses	17 [81%]	2 [9.5%]	2 [9.5%]

All responses received from the 21 households were completed written questionnaires.

We also received general responses from a member of the Resident's Association and Defend Council Housing. These general responses did not respond to the consultation questionnaire set out and have both been responded to directly in other forums. These responses are expanded on at the end of this report.

Questions 1 and 2 referred to personal data.

#### Question 3: Please indicate which option is your preferred option

	Secure tenants	Resident Leaseholders	Non-resident leaseholders
Option 1 – retain and refurbish	6	2	0
Option 2 – demolish and replace	11	0	2

The above table shows that of the 21 responses received, secure tenants were more strongly in favour of option 2 (11 or 65% for option 2; 6 or 35% for option 1). Resident leaseholders exclusively chose option 1, whilst non-resident leaseholders exclusively chose option 2.

#### Question 4: Please state why you preferred this option.

**Those in favour of option 1:**

The below table sets out all of the reasons given for supporting option 1.

**[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]**

### **Summary and response to comments**

**Happy with current property:** A number of the responses note that they are happy with their current properties, community and/or neighbourhood and therefore have no desire to move. The council recognises that moving home can be a stressful experience and will work closely with residents to ensure that they can find a property that they like in an area that is good for them, wherever possible. Where residents wish to remain on the Broadwater Farm estate (e.g., in a similar property), effort will be made to enable this in one move. Where this isn't possible, residents would have the opportunity to move back to the estate when a suitable property becomes available.

**Re-imbusement for improvements:** One respondent noted that they had made improvements to their home in the form of decorations. Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, Disturbance Payments can cover 'Home improvements that have been notified and approved by the Council, less the cost of depreciation.' In this situation, rehousing officers would work with this resident to try to arrange re-imbusement for the costs of home improvements.

**Demolition and construction:** One respondent argued that the issues presented in the consultation are normal parts of the demolition and construction process and therefore the reasons for offering demolition does not make sense. The council firmly believes that the situation of Stapleford North is unique due to its very close proximity to Northolt and the fact that these buildings are directly connected to one another. Although the council acknowledges demolition and construction would be possible in such close proximity, the consultation made clear that the council believed residents should be aware of this and be able to make an informed decision. The reasons for considering demolition also related to the wider benefits to the whole estate. These benefits included improved placemaking opportunities, more family homes, safer and wider streets, and improved layout at the heart of the estate.

This response also argued that all residents can access their property via the Stapleford main entrance. Whilst this is true, step-free access to certain properties (i.e., via a lift) is currently provided through Northolt. This could be re-provided in the event of retention and refurbishment – it would not be suitable for the council to not re-provide this access.

### **Those in favour of option 2:**

The below table sets out all of the reasons given for supporting option 2.

**[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]**

### **Summary and response to comments**

**Overcrowding:** A number of responses highlighted overcrowding as a reason for supporting option 2. Due to the Stapleford North block consisting only of 1-bedroom flats, these residents will be supported through the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy to move to

more suitable properties for their family's needs. Similarly, a number of respondents highlighted their desire to move home for other reasons.

**Condition of blocks:** Two respondents highlighted the poor condition of the existing blocks, with one response specifically highlighting that they do not believe improving the blocks would be good value for money. Whilst the council believes that refurbishing the block is possible and would improve its longevity, the design team highlight that there are significant additional benefits to demolition – including improved green and open space, better ground floor layout, more family homes, and new, high quality council homes. Therefore, the council agrees that demolition and re-provision offers better value for money on the whole.

**Question 5: Do you think there is an option we haven't considered? If so, could you provide details below.**

This question received fewer responses, with only 3 out of 21 respondents choosing to answer this question. Of those that did respond to this question, all were in favour of option 2 (demolition). The responses are in the table below:

**[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]**

### **Summary and response to comments**

**Lift access:** The first response proposes a lift for Stapleford North. This was already part of the proposals for option 1 (retain and refurbish), where a lift would have been built to re-provide step-free access for those who currently use the lift in Northolt. It is unclear if the respondent meant something different to this.

**Rehousing:** The second response refers to 'permanent rehousing' under option 1. Although this was not included in option 1, the consultation materials set out clearly that this could be possible under the retain and refurbish option if residents wished us to consider this. It is not clear whether this response wished for this option to be chosen or just wanted to highlight it.

**Rents:** The third response highlights an important issue about future rents. This is an issue that the council are aware of and are working hard to address. Under the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, residents would be supported by rehousing officers to find a property that was both suitable for their needs (e.g., family composition) and is affordable to live in. Residents would not be asked to move to properties that were not suitable for them.

Insofar as the response is referring to the future rents of the replacement council homes, the council does anticipate these rents to be more expensive due to the improved space standards and quality of the homes. However, they will still be secure council tenancies and work is ongoing to determine the likely rent levels of these homes so that residents have this information prior to the resident ballot. They will be calculated as social rents on the same basis as they are now and therefore any rent increases will be due to the improved quality and standards of the new homes. We anticipate that some increased cost will be offset by lower running costs and improved energy efficiency.

**Question 6: Do you have any other comments you would like to make with reference to the two options?**

This question received fewer responses, with only 10 out of 21 respondents choosing to answer this question. Of those that did wish to make further comments, the responses are provided in the table below:

**[Table redacted (unredacted in EXEMPT version of this document)]**

### **Summary and response to comments**

**Timing:** The first response relates to when tenants need to be notified (this response was received from a non-resident leaseholder). If approved by Cabinet in September 2021, the demolition of Stapleford North would be included in the 'preferred design scenario' to be presented to residents in an estate wide ballot. The current programme sets out that the 'preferred design scenario' would be agreed by Cabinet in October 2021, with the ballot due to be held in November 2021. Under this timeline, the rehousing process for residents would begin in December 2021 following a 'yes' outcome in the ballot. If the ballot was a 'no' outcome, more work would need to be undertaken before rehousing would commence. Therefore, communication with all residents in this block will be ongoing throughout September-December 2021 to ensure they understand the next steps and when rehousing is likely to begin.

**Rent:** The rent issue raised in the second response has been addressed in the previous section, above.

**Rehousing needs:** The issue raised by the deaf resident is one that council officers were already aware of. Under the rehousing process (should it go ahead following the ballot), rehousing officers would work closely with this resident to ensure that their new property provided them with suitable light and conditions so as not to impede on their ability to communicate.

**Cost of moving:** One resident expressed a concern around the cost of moving and whether the payments offered by the council would be sufficient to cover all associated costs. The Broadwater Farm rehousing and payments policy sets out the payments residents will be eligible for through the rehousing process. The disturbance payment will cover the costs of moving and can either be paid a flat rate or can be based on the actual costs incurred by the residents. The principle of the policy is that no resident will be financially worse off as a result of costs associated with moving and the rehousing team will work with residents to ensure all necessary costs are covered. These costs include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Cost of removals
- Cost of mail redirection
- Cost of reconnection of appliances
- Cost of address changes

**Leaseholder Charges:** One respondent noted the impact that leaseholder charges may have on them in the event of refurbishment and retention – and noted that they felt this did not offer good value for money for them or for the council. Although refurbishment and retention is deliverable, the council also agrees that demolition and re-provision offers the best value for money in terms of benefits to residents and the wider estate and long-term investment.

### **Demographics of respondents.**

A number of respondents did not complete or only partially completed the equalities form. Therefore, much of the data below is not complete.

### Sex

Sex	Number of responses
Male	6
Female	7
No response / not known	8

### Age

Age	Number of responses
Under 20	
21-30	1
31-40	1
41-50	2
51-60	3
61-70	2
71+	5
No response / not known	7

### Disability

Disability	Number of responses
Yes	5
No	8
No response / not known	8

### Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of responses
Arab	1
Asian	2
Black	7
Mixed	
Other	2
White	3
No response / not known	6

### Religion

Religion	Number of responses
Christian	5
Muslim	9
No religion	1
Other	1
No response / not known	5

Other responses:

Defend Council Housing

Paul Burnham, part of the Defend Council Housing group, provided a detailed response to the consultation. David Joyce, Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration responded to the concerns raised in detail. The original letter from Defend Council Housing is included at the end of this report. This response is re-provided below for reference:

Dear Paul,

Thank you for contacting us with your concerns about the consultation currently taking place at Stapleford North on the Broadwater Farm estate. Councillor Gordon has asked me to respond on her behalf.

I appreciate you setting these out so that I can ensure we are providing clarity and confidence for residents throughout the consultation.

Haringey council understand the importance of council housing and the security offered by council tenancies and council properties. We are passionate about building a new generation of council homes so that residents can continue to benefit from them for decades to come.

I hope that this response goes some way to re-assuring you that our interests lie with ensuring the best outcomes for our residents.

As your query covered a range of issues I have set out some information using the same headings.

### **(1) Withholding the Refurbishment with Decant Option**

#### **The consultation materials**

Whilst I appreciate that the refurbishment with decant option was not included as one of the main two options, the council has included this option within the consultation materials and is willing and able to deliver upon this if residents wished us to do so. I believe that some of the confusion is due to the fact that the wording you quote is from a draft version of the consultation materials.

As you will note from your scanned copy of page 4, the final published version reads:

*'A further option would be for all residents of Stapleford North (flats 25-36 and 61-72) to be rehoused for the duration of the works to Northolt and then have the option to move back into your homes (if you wished) once the works were complete. Stapleford North would be refurbished as under option one, below. The Council is not proposing this as an option because:*

- 1. It would require residents to move for a period of up to three and a half years, which would be disruptive and inconvenient for residents. Residents could return to the refurbished homes if they wished.*
- 2. During engagement with residents, no resident has suggested to the Council that they would want this as an option.*

*Nevertheless, if you would wish the Council to choose this as an option, you can say so in response to question 5 on the survey included in this pack (or indeed any other option we haven't considered).'*

The intention was that this would make it clear that, while the Council is not proposing it for the reasons given, there is an option of a full decant with a right to return to refurbished homes.

However, given that the structure of the block, if simply refurbished, would remain that of a late 1960s/early 1970s system build, it is clear that demolition and rebuilding would produce

higher quality homes. Therefore, if residents were to move out for a significant period of time anyway, the council believes that it would be sensible to take the opportunity of producing the new, high quality council homes residents deserve. This is why option two is presented as a demolition option. I also believe that the numerous other benefits to the whole estate that are set out within the consultation materials would be a positive thing for all existing and future Broadwater Farm residents.

Design work has shown that residents in this block can remain in-situ for the duration of the demolition and rebuilding works taking place at Northolt. The council however wished to consult with residents due to the disruption this may cause them. We opted not to present a preferred option in this consultation, as it is important to us that residents are able to freely express their preference to us.

Because the demolition and rebuilding works would not mean that these residents have to move, the criteria within the Housing Allocations Policy according residents Band A priority for rehousing 'where Homes for Haringey (on behalf of the Council) needs to provide alternative accommodation for its tenant in order to carry out repairs or improvements to their property or where the tenant needs to be moved as part of a regeneration scheme' (see below) would not be met.

However, if the option taken is for the block to remain and for structural and refurbishment works to be done then, where the works do require people to move, they will be supported in line with council policy, including the Housing Allocations Policy when applicable.

The Housing Allocations Policy (15.14.8) states that 'for the tenant to be awarded decant priority, the Decants Panel will need to be satisfied that the work is so disruptive that it cannot be completed with the tenants remaining in occupation and either:

- The work is likely to take more than 3 months to complete; or
- The health of the tenant or a member of their household will be severely affected if they have to leave their home and then move back again at a later date.'

Where decants are necessary for repairs 'moves will usually be temporary but in some circumstances consideration will be given to permanent moves arising from a decant.' (15.14.2 of the Housing Allocations Policy).

At present, it is not believed that the structural and refurbishment works would require anyone in the block to move out for more than 3 months. This is why option one of the consultation (refurbish and retain) refers to these moves as temporary. In the additional option provided, the council have notified residents that if they wished to move for the duration of the demolition and rebuild (as opposed to temporary moves due to refurbishment) then we would be able to deliver this option. However, the council does not believe that this option provides the best outcomes for the residents in this block or for the Broadwater Farm estate as a whole.

Whilst developing more detailed designs to the structural improvements and refurbishment for Stapleford North – if this is the option chosen - it will become clearer which residents may be required to move to undertake this work and for how long. Should residents be required to move for a period of more than 3 months, they would be rehoused according to the Housing Allocations Policy. This means that they would have a Right to Return, or to remain, at their option.

It is correct that the Council seeks to comply with the judgment in *R (on the application of Moseley) v London Borough of Haringey [2014]*; for obvious reasons, both officers have this well in mind.

## **”... officers have been canvassing demolition options with residents without Cabinet approval**

We wrote to and spoke to residents prior to the Cabinet decision on 13<sup>th</sup> July to let them know about the proposed upcoming consultation and the options that would be presented. These conversations were to ensure that residents were aware in advance of proposals in relation to their homes and prepared for the consultation, to increase participation, and ensure residents were properly supported e.g., with language or accessibility needs. Cabinet approval is not required for such engagement.

Due to the sensitivity of the issue and awareness that such consultations can be stressful for residents, we believed that it was important to ensure residents were engaged early so that they would be aware of what was happening and how they can have their opinions heard.

### **(2) Right of Return compromised**

We are strongly committed to the Right to Return and I believe the council has been clear in the commitments made to residents. We are absolutely committed to ensuring that – should demolition be the preferred option – residents moved from the estate would have a Right to Return. This is in line with several council policies as we recognise the impact that such schemes can have on residents who undoubtedly have connections to their community and surrounding area.

The sentence quoted from page 10 of the consultation pack (‘You are likely to have to move away from Broadwater Farm, either for a number of years or on a permanent basis’) is contextualised by the repeated and clear references to the Right to Return that precede it. The immediately previous page (page 9) states that:

*‘The first new homes on the estate are expected to be completed in late 2024 or early 2025. **You can either stay in the home that you have moved to or you could return to a new property on the estate under the right to return policy**’.* (emphasis added)

The Right to Return is emphasised throughout the consultation materials and it is clear for residents that the wording to which you refer is about the residents’ choice to remain in their decant accommodation or to return. It is not about the council deciding whether they can return.

If the decision is taken to demolish the block, the Broadwater Farm Relhousing and Payments policy will apply. This policy guarantees two Rights to Return to the estate for secure tenants (to an available Broadwater Farm home if they wish and to a new home once completed). This policy was consulted on extensively in 2018 and it offers strong guarantees to residents. Haringey Council are in agreement with Defend Council Housing about the importance of Right to Return commitments being honoured in the event of estate regeneration.

### **(3) Rents, and the policy commitment that no residents will be financially worse off**

I recognise that all residents will be concerned about changes to rents at the new council homes. I understand the importance of this issue and we are working to ensure residents are provided with clarity on this issue before we ask them to vote for or against our proposals in the ballot.

However, I do not believe that the figures you are quoting are an accurate representation of the rents of the new homes. Similarly, I do not believe it is fair to characterise the new homes as anything other than council properties with secure council tenancies – just as the current properties are.

To be clear, the new homes will be secure council tenancies at council rents. As the consultation materials make clear, the rents of these new properties will not be exactly the same as current rents. Social rents are calculated using a government formula and the council uses this formula to set its rents. We are currently at an early design stage for new homes and work to establish future rent levels is ongoing. Crucially, initial estimates suggest they would be significantly lower than those you quote, which assumes the formula rent cap would be reached. Due to the relatively low land values on the estate, it is highly unlikely that the new rents would reach this cap.

The figures quoted also assume all existing service charges paid by BWF will be paid on new homes. The work to establish service charges is not yet complete and so the figures quoted are unlikely to be correct. Further to this, the new homes will be more energy efficient and hence cheaper to run. This will help to offset any change in rent.

The commitment to residents not being financially worse off, contained within the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP), and re-iterated in the consultation materials, is expanded upon within both the ERRPP and the consultation materials. The ERRPP states that:

- 1) 'Haringey Council is also committed to ensuring that no resident should be financially worse off as a result of the renewal scheme. But this does not necessarily mean that every tenant, leaseholder and freeholder will pay exactly the same housing costs after the move as they did before the move' (pages 8-9).
- 2) 'This means that rents will change for some tenants, particularly if they move to larger or smaller homes, or change landlords, as a result of the renewal scheme' (page 9).
- 3) 'The commitment that no tenant will be financially worse off as a result of the renewal scheme is deemed as being met by ensuring that a home is available on the scheme at an equivalent rent, and by the payment of the Home Loss and Disturbance payments to cover tenants' costs. The commitment to ensuring that the new home is at an equivalent rent means that the rent for the new property will be calculated on the same basis as their current rent. Where a tenant is on a social rent, this means that the new rent will also be a social rent, calculated according to the rent policies of the new landlord, not for example an "Affordable Rent" at up to 80% of market rents' (page 9).

The consultation materials state that:

- 1) 'No tenant or leaseholder will be financially worse off. This means that you will be supported with Home Loss and Disturbance Payments. The rent of the new Council homes will be calculated on the same basis as your current rent. It does not mean that your rent will be exactly the same as it is now' (page 7).
- 2) 'If you are a secure tenant and you move to another council home, your rent will still be a council rent but may be different to the rent you're currently paying. Any changes to your future rent or service charges will be discussed with you in detail as part of the rehousing process' (page 10).

I believe that these quotes from both documents emphasise and clarify the fact that the rents of the new council homes will not be exactly the same as the rents on the estate currently.

I recognise that residents deserve clarity on this issue before being asked to support our proposals and we will ensure that residents get this. Full details on the proposed rents will be included in the landlord offer so that existing residents of Broadwater Farm, and those who have been moved from Northolt and Tangmere, will have clear information about the proposed rents for new homes.

If the decision is taken to demolish Stapleford North, rehousing officers will work closely with residents to ensure that the new homes they move to are affordable for them. Residents would also be supported through this move with a number of payments, including disturbance payments, as set out in the consultation materials and Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy.

#### **(4) Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor (ITLA)**

In advance of the consultation, on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2021, residents in Stapleford North received a letter which gave them more information about why the council is undertaking this consultation and letting them know how to get involved; the letter also provided details of the Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor (ITLA), who can give residents impartial information and advice about the consultation and the options.

The covering letter to the consultation materials should have repeated this information. It was an error that this was not included.

A further letter has now been sent to the residents on re-iterating that an ITLA is available and letting them know their contact details - which are as follows:

- Pam Kovachich, Independent Tenant and Leaseholder Advisor: PPCR Associates, [pkovachich@ppcr.org.uk](mailto:pkovachich@ppcr.org.uk) 020 7199 0901 or 07966 595 527.

#### **(5) S105 Consultation materials not made publicly available**

On 28<sup>th</sup> July 2021, the consultation materials and information were posted on Haringey's website [here](#) and linked to the full booklet and questionnaire [here](#). I recognise that these should have gone live at the same time as the launch of the consultation, on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2021.

The information can now also be found [here](#), on the council's Section 105 area of the website.

Due to the two-day delay in this information being made public, the council will be extending the consultation until Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> August 2021. I apologise for the error and we will work hard to ensure all residents are given enough opportunity to respond to the consultation.

#### **Delegated authority**

In respect of the required delegations we believe we have worked within Council policy and the terms of the delegated authority.

#### **Conclusion**

I am grateful that you have written to me and I hope the above addresses the concerns you have raised. We believe strongly that our proposals will make the Broadwater Farm estate a better place to live for generations to come – improving safety and security, providing more council homes, delivering more family homes, creating opportunities for local people, and introducing new services and amenities that will benefit all residents. I believe these are ambitions that we can all support in the future.

#### **The Resident's Association**

On 21<sup>st</sup> July 2021, an email was sent to David Sherrington, Director of Broadwater Farm, from a member of the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association. The letter sets out a number of concerns with the consultation. It has been re-produced in full at the bottom of this report, with the council's responses to the issues raised provided here:

**Response:** It is important to note that the email was received in response to the Resident's Association reviewing the draft version of the consultation materials (5 days before the consultation opened). Therefore, some of the comments do not relate to the material in the final form that was provided to residents in Stapleford North.

In response to the first point, it is important to note that in the final version of the consultation materials a permanent move for the duration of the refurbishment, demolition of Northolt, and building of new homes was possible. Residents were encouraged to note if they wished this option to be considered. Only one resident did so, which has been expanded on earlier in this report. Where the consultation materials referenced a temporary move for refurbishment, this was presumed to be a move shorter than 3 months – which under the Housing Allocations Policy does not require permanent rehousing. Were households required to move for longer, this would have been done in accordance with the Housing Allocations Policy.

The reference to no tenant or leaseholder being financially worse off refers to the provisions set out in the Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy (ERRPP). This provision refers to the costs of moving home. In the final consultation materials provided to Stapleford North residents, this was made clear with some additional text: 'No tenant or leaseholder will be financially worse off. This means that you will be supported with Home Loss and Disturbance Payments. The rent of the new Council homes will be calculated on the same basis as your current rent. It does not mean that your rent will be exactly the same as it is now' (page 7 of the consultation materials). This language made it clear that we were not promising rents would be the same as they are now.

We did not agree with the request to delay or postpone the consultation and felt that it was carried out in a fair and transparent way that gave residents real choice over their future options.

### Other responses to the consultation in full

#### Paul Burnham letter on behalf of Defend Council Housing

Haringey Council is refusing to move people facing excessive noise and disturbance at Broadwater Farm: unless they agree to the demolition of their homes in a consultation which starts on Monday 26 July 2021.

Paul Burnham of Haringey Defend Council Housing says, **“The Council is bullying residents to accept demolition if they want a peaceful life. The consultation options are not fair choices, and they need to add the third option of the block being repaired while residents are temporarily re-located during the works period.”**

In 2018, Haringey Council agreed to demolish two blocks at Broadwater Farm for safety reasons. On 13 July 2021 the Council’s Cabinet agreed to consult residents on the additional demolition of the 24 homes at Stapleford North.

The reason given by the Council for proposing demolition at Stapleford North is that residents ‘face heightened levels of disruption for an extensive period through demolition [of the neighbouring Northolt block], new build works and refurbishment works’. At the Cabinet meeting Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for House Building, Placemaking and Development, said that Stapleford North **“is going to be right in middle of an area that is going to be full of dust and construction works for a very long period of time”**.

The consultation will offer residents just two options:

- Remain in their homes throughout the duration of the works and while the block is refurbished.
- Agree that the block should be demolished and replaced with new council owned homes.

This is in breach of good practice, and of the council's own policy, because in cases of excessive disturbance from works, a temporary move away should be offered, often with options of a right to remain in the new property, or to return to the existing property once it has been refurbished (yes, a choice for residents!). This is known as a 'decant'; and as treating people with fairness, decency and respect.

The Council's Housing Allocations Policy says: 'Decants occur when a Decants Panel has decided that a transfer to alternative accommodation offers the best way of ensuring that essential repairs and redevelopment take place without causing huge disruption or hardship to the tenants'.

**Also, the Council is not telling the tenants that rents for the new homes after demolition would have rents 87% higher than at present (rent increases of £69.32 per week), and total rent including service charges of £183.57 pw instead of £114.25 pw at present. What will happen if people cannot afford these big rent increases?**

**This is all part of a pattern. At Stapleford North, you must agree to demolition, otherwise we will make your life a misery for years. All Broadwater Farm residents must vote for the redevelopment plan this Autumn, otherwise the external decorations (including communal areas inside the blocks) will never be done. They are supposed to be done once every five years, but were last done 17 years ago; and much of the estate looks terrible because of landlord neglect."**

Increasing rents by demolition is part of a strategy of forced gentrification and social cleansing, but tenants and residents will continue to resist.

**When we knocked on doors to talk to people at Stapleford North on Saturday, there was plenty of support for 'no demolitions and no rent increases'. Meanwhile the Council must comply with its Decant policy, advise tenants on the real amounts of future rents, and abandon the flawed consultation at Stapleford North, which begins on Monday 26 July.**

### **The Resident's Association**

On 21<sup>st</sup> July 2021, an email was sent to David Sherrington, Director of Broadwater Farm, from a member of the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association. It has been re-produced in full below:

Dear David

The consultation is misleading. We are talking here about moving people because they cannot stay in their home when work is being carried out due to noise and disruption which is a decant. You state that the only options if the block is not demolished are for residents to stay while the work is being done or going for a very long term 'temporary' move and coming back when all the noise of demolition and building the new homes is finished (2 years or so until the new homes are built as far as I can tell). As you know, if a decant is going to be for a long period, i.e. a year or more, then under HfH policy the person being decanted can be given a permanent home somewhere else. When their property is ready to be occupied again it could be let to another tenant. This would avoid the need for replacing Stapleford

North with higher cost homes at 'New Homes Rent' which it may not be possible to rent to the lowest income households due to the benefit cap. Why are the existing residents not being consulted on this option?

Also, in the 'Option two Demolish Stapleford North' section you state:

'No tenant or leaseholder will be financially worse off.

All tenants and resident leaseholders will have a right to return (if they wish to do so).'

This is misleading. It implies the tenants won't be financially worse off they come back to one of the new homes. They will be worse off if it is at 'New Homes Rent' and you have no guarantee it won't be. Also, tenants may end up being signed up for one of the other homes around Haringey being built at New Homes Rent. This already happened to at least one Love Lane decantee who ended up massively worse off.

You must put the consultation on hold until it is rewritten with an honest choice of options and cast-iron guarantees over rent that have been signed off by the financial officers responsible for this. These guarantees must be put in front of the Council, agreed and included in publicly available minutes.

Yours sincerely

XXX

(Broadwater Farm Residents' Association)