

## **Report on the Broadwater Farm consultations**

On 26 June 2018 Cabinet agreed to carry out four consultations relating to the structural issues identified with the Tangmere and Northolt blocks on the Broadwater Farm estate. These were:

- A consultation with the residents of Tangmere on the future of the block, with the Council's preferred option being to demolish the block and rebuild the homes on the estate
- A consultation with the residents of Northolt on the future of the block, with the Council's preferred option being to demolish the block and rebuild the homes on the estate
- A consultation on a draft Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy, which would set out how residents are rehoused from the block (as all scenarios for addressing the structural issues would require at least the temporary rehousing of all residents from the blocks).
- A consultation on a draft Broadwater Farm Local Lettings Policy, which would apply if one or both of the blocks was demolished and would allow tenants to return to the estate more quickly by prioritising future lets for tenants who have moved off the estate due to the structural issues.

In the case of the consultations on the future of Tangmere and Northolt, this constituted a section 105 consultation under the Housing Act 1985 for secure tenants. There is no statutory duty to consult leaseholders, though the consultation also sought their views.

This report sets out the outcomes of these four consultations and the responses to the questions within each consultation. Where appropriate, the consultations asked responders to give reasons for their answers and these are also summarised.

The findings of the consultation will be used to guide decisions made by the Council regarding:

- The future of Tangmere
- The future of Northolt
- The content of the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy
- How the Local Lettings Policy will operate, including who will be given priority

### **The Consultation**

The four consultations ran from 12 September to 10 October 2018 with each secure tenant and resident leaseholder being issued an individual consultation pack (a covering letter and questionnaire). In the case of joint tenants or a lease in two names, both individuals were given a pack.

The packs were hand delivered to all residents in Tangmere and Northolt, and were made available in other languages, large print and Braille as needed.

During the consultations, a number of drop-in events were arranged for residents to ask questions. These were held in the foyer areas of Tangmere and Northolt themselves, to ensure that residents could easily attend. They were also held into the early evening for those who were not at home during the day. Translators for the main languages other than English spoken on the estate (Turkish and Somali) were present at all sessions, and translators for other languages arranged as necessary.

Date	Time	Venue
12 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	3pm - 7pm	Base of Tangmere
18 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	3pm - 7pm	Base of Northolt
22 <sup>nd</sup> September 2018	12 midday to 2 pm	Community Centre, Adams Road, Tottenham
26 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	3pm - 7pm	Base of Tangmere
3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2018	3pm - 7pm	Base of Northolt
10 <sup>th</sup> October 2018	3pm - 7pm	Base of Tangmere

The Council also undertook door-knocking in both blocks and discussed the consultations with Tangmere tenants as they moved. Further work was also undertaken by the Independent Tenant Leaseholder Advisors who also held drop-in sessions and undertook their own door-knocking.

### **Responses**

During the consultation period, a total of 108 responses were received from 105 of the 206 properties (51%) with a further response being received two weeks after the consultation closed. This final response, from a Tangmere tenant has not been included in the tables in this report.

Response rates varied between Tangmere (42 out of 104 properties or 40%) and Northolt (63 out of 102 properties or 62%). A breakdown of responses and properties by tenure and block are provided below.

Conversations with residents indicate that Tangmere was lower as many had already been made an offer of alternative accommodation under the Tangmere Rehousing Priority Scheme (which was approved by the Council as an interim scheme to enable rehousing to commence before the October deadline). The response rate from Tangmere is still relatively high for consultations of this type.

Block	Secure tenants	Resident leaseholders*	Total
<b>Tangmere</b> <i>104 properties</i>	<b>42 responses</b> <i>from 41 properties</i>	<b>1 response</b> <i>From 1 properties</i>	<b>43 responses</b> <i>from 42 properties</i>
<b>Northolt</b> <i>102 properties</i>	<b>55 responses</b> <i>from 53 properties</i>	<b>10 responses</b> <i>from 10 properties</i>	<b>65 responses</b> <i>from 63 properties</i>
<b>Both</b> <i>206 properties</i>	<b>97 responses</b> <i>from 94 properties</i>	<b>11 responses</b> <i>from 11 properties</i>	<b>108 responses</b> <i>from 105 properties</i>

\* The Resident leaseholder responses includes one response from a leaseholder's tenant

Responses were also received from the Broadwater Farm Residents Association ("BFRA") - which set out responses to each question and their reasons - and Defend Council Housing which set out general reasons requesting a ballot but did not provide responses to each question.

These additional responses are not included in the totals above or in the individual tables for each answer. However, the report does provide their comments on each question.

Section 105 consultation:

Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985 places a legal obligation on local housing authorities to consult with secure tenants on “matters of housing management” which are likely to significantly affect them such as the demolition of properties. This consultation was carried out separately for each block and considered independently of each block. This is reflected in the tables below which report separately the responses from the secure tenants and other residents who responded.

## **SECTION 105 CONSULTATION: THE FUTURE OF TANGMERE**

The S105 consultation on the future of Tangmere asked the following question and whether they agreed or disagreed. The table below shows the responses.

### **Do you agree with the Council's proposal to demolish Tangmere and then build new homes of the Broadwater Farm Estate?**

	Secure tenants		Other	
Strongly Agree	31*	38 (90%)	-	1
Broadly Agree	7		1	
Not Sure				
Broadly Disagree	2	4 (10%)	-	-
Strongly Disagree	2		-	
<b>Total</b>	<b>42*</b>		<b>1</b>	

\* the above total does not include the one response received 2 weeks after the consultation closed which strongly agreed with the proposal.

As can be seen from the above table, there was overwhelming support for the proposal with 39 residents / 91% of all residents agreeing with the proposal and only 4 residents / 9% of all residents disagreeing.

Those agreeing with the proposal explained that they supported the proposal as they felt the block was very old, was in a poor condition, and that it should be replaced with new homes.

Only four tenants disagreed with the proposal, one explaining that they did not support the proposal as that the tenant felt it unfair that only two out of 13 blocks were to be demolished.

### **Other responses**

In addition to the table above, two other responses to the consultation were received.

The first was from the BFRA who provided one response for both blocks which was that they were 'Not sure' whether they supported the proposal. The reasons given for this was that they felt that a ballot was needed and that they were

*"not happy that there is enough evidence that, in the event of demolition, promises to re-provide at least the same number of council houses at council rents well be kept".*

and that

*"The consultation documents give figures for the cost of re-providing council housing in an effort to show that this will be a financially sound option. However, no evidence is given to back up the cost figures for rebuilding, there are no references to other documents which show that the rebuilding costs given are correct figures"*

Defend Council Housing also submitted a response which again provided the same response for both blocks which was that they disagreed with the proposal. Although the Council had committed to re-providing the same number of Council homes, the main reasons for their disagreement was that

*"it seems very unlikely that the Council would fund an equal number of council properties at equal rents to those currently existing"*

and that;

*“the plan to demolish Tangmere and Northolt is part of a wider plan to knock down a homeless hostel on The Avenue, adjacent to the estate, the Enterprise Centre and a now abandoned school building, in a ‘ribbon of redevelopment’ across Broadwater Farm”.*

### Priorities for Tangmere residents

The s105 consultation then asked residents to clarify how important five statements were.

**Please tell us how important the following statements are to you:**

Description	Very important	Important	Neither important or unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Not important at all	No response
Having the same number, or more, council homes at council rents as now	29	6	2	1	-	5
Making sure Tangmere residents can stay on Broadwater Farm	17	6	5	4	6	5
Having more larger homes that better meet the needs of local residents (ie more family homes)	31	5	1	1	3	2
Improving the quality of homes on the BWF estate	30	5	1	1	3	3
The cost to the Council and value for money for council tenants	25	7	5	-	2	4

All these statements were assessed as “very important” by the BFRA.

The responses indicate that providing new and larger homes were the main priorities of residents, and that providing homes for them to return has the lowest priority.

## **SECTION 105 CONSULTATION: THE FUTURE OF NORTHOLT**

The S105 consultation on the future of Northolt asked the following question and whether they agreed or disagreed. The table below shows the responses.

### **Do you agree with the Council's proposal to demolish Northolt and then build new homes of the Broadwater Farm Estate?**

	Secure tenants		Other	
Strongly Agree	38	46	7	7
Broadly Agree	8	(84%)	-	(70%)
Not Sure	2	2	-	-
Broadly Disagree	5	7	3	3
Strongly Disagree	2	(13%)	-	(30%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>		<b>10</b>	

As can be seen from the above table, there was overwhelming support for the proposal with 53 residents / 82% of all residents agreeing with the proposal and only 10 residents / 15% of all residents disagreeing.

Those agreeing with the proposal explained that they supported the proposal as they felt the block was very old, was in a poor condition and not worth repairing, and that it should be replaced with new homes.

Of the 10 residents who disagreed with the proposal, only four explained their reasons, with three providing the same response. One response stated the reason for not supporting the proposal was that their *"wish would be for my flat to be fixed along with the rest of Northolt for returning to later"*. The joint statement advised that their reasons for not supporting the proposal was around the reimbursement to leaseholders but that *"If the Council were to make a fair value valuation, then we would be happy to remove our objections"*.

#### Other responses

In addition to the table above, two other responses to the consultation were received.

The first was from the BFRA who provided one response for both blocks which was that they were 'Not sure' whether they supported the proposal. The reasons given for this was that they felt that a ballot was needed and that they were

*"not happy that there is enough evidence that, in the event of demolition, promises to re-provide at least the same number of council houses at council rents well be kept"*.

and that

*"The consultation documents give figures for the cost of re-providing council housing in an effort to show that this will be a financially sound option. However, no evidence is given to back up the cost figures for rebuilding, there are no references to other documents which show that the rebuilding costs given are correct figures"*

Defend Council Housing also submitted a response which again provided the same response for both blocks which was that they disagreed with the proposal. Although the

Council had committed to re-providing the same number of Council homes, the main reasons for their disagreement was that

*“it seems very unlikely that the Council would fund an equal number of council properties at equal rents to those currently existing”*

and that;

*“the plan to demolish Tangmere and Northolt is part of a wider plan to knock down a homeless hostel on The Avenue, adjacent to the estate, the Enterprise Centre and a now abandoned school building, in a ‘ribbon of redevelopment’ across Broadwater Farm”.*

### Priorities for Northolt residents

The s105 consultation then asked residents to clarify how important five statements were.

**Please tell us how important the following statements are to you:**

Description	Very important	Important	Neither important or unimportant	Fairly unimportant	Not important at all	No response
Having the same number, or more, council homes at council rents as now	41	8	4	4	-	8
Making sure Northolt residents can stay on Broadwater Farm	27	8	15	2	6	7
Having more larger homes that better meet the needs of local residents (ie more family homes)	43	10	-	1	2	9
Improving the quality of homes on the BWF estate	48	6	2	1	1	7
The cost to the Council and value for money for council tenants	35	15	5	2	-	8

All these statements were assessed as “very important” by the BFRA.

The responses indicate that improving the quality of homes is the main priority of residents, and that providing homes for them to return has the lowest priority.

## **CONSULTATION ON THE BROADWATER FARM REHOUSING AND PAYMENTS POLICY**

Consultation on the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy (RPP) was also undertaken. The proposed policy will have a long-term impact on the residents of Tangmere and Northolt. It was therefore important that these residents could contribute to the development of this policy before a final version was approved.

The draft RPP set out the priorities for rehousing, the size of properties offered to tenants, how those properties would be offered and the Right to Return to the estate. The draft policy also set out payments to tenants and offer of an Equity Loan to resident leaseholders.

As Tangmere residents were already being rehoused in the manner set out in the (TRPS) the 5 questions 1-5 were only asked to Northolt residents. The first two tables provided below therefore only contain answers from Northolt residents.

### **Are there any other groups who you think should be given priority?**

Northolt tenants were asked about the priority for new homes. While most respondents were in favour of the priorities given, or provided no comments, the other groups who respondents felt should be given priority included;

- Households with children (mentioned in 6 responses)
- Households with physical or mental health issues (4 responses)
- Households with an elderly residents (3 responses)

The BFRA agreed with the proposal priorities.

### **What size home do you think tenants should be offered?**

Northolt tenants were asked what size home tenants should be offered.

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Responses</b>
The appropriate size home for the household	46 (71%)
The same size as their current home	14 (22%)
Blank or no response	5 (8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>65 (100%)*</b>

*\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding*

The vast majority of those who answered this question (50 out of 60 respondents or 83%) supported the appropriate size home for the household being offered.

The BFRA response was that tenants should be offered an “*appropriate size home for the household*” but that “*tenants should not be offered a property that is smaller than their current property*”



**It is Council policy to allow a household to keep one spare room if they voluntarily move to a smaller property. Do you think that residents who downsize from Northolt should be able to keep one spare room?**

Northolt tenants were asked about under-occupying households.

Answer	Responses
Yes	43 (66%)
No	12 (18%)
'Don't know' or no response	10 (15%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>65 (100%)*</b>

*\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding*

The majority of those who answered this question supported the council policy to allow households to retain a spare bedroom. However, it should be noted that all Northolt properties have one bedroom, so will have no effect on Northolt tenants.

**Do you have any comments about the proposal to make one offer of accommodation?**

Northolt residents were asked about their thoughts on the proposal to only offer tenants one property through a Direct Offer. The summary below includes comments made to both this particular question and the following question about future moves.

19 residents expressed the view that they should be allowed more than one offer, with most of these suggesting two or three offers. 10 residents expressed that residents should be given a choice and/or that properties should be allocated through the Choice Based Lettings scheme. However, three residents expressly stated that they were against the Choice Based Lettings scheme being used.

**Do you have any comments about future moves?**

While 19 Northolt residents provided a full response to this question, there was no general theme apart from a concern about needing to move more than once, the type of property they wished to have and whether they were in favour or against Choice Based Lettings.

The BFRA commented that tenants should not be asked to move to a smaller property as a result of any demolition, and that residents should remain top priority until they receive a new home.

**Do you agree that secure tenants who have had to move off the estate due to the demolition of their existing block should be prioritised for new homes if and when they are built?**

This and the following questions were asked to all residents.

Answer	Responses
Yes	92 (85%)
No	7 (6%)
'Don't know' or no response	9 (8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>108 (100%)*</b>

*\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding*

The vast majority of residents of those who answered this question (92 out of 99 respondents or 93%) supported this proposal.

The BFRA also supported this proposal but demanded ‘a *guaranteed not a ‘prioritised’ right to return*’.

**Do you think that resident leaseholders should have a guaranteed right of return to new homes built on the estate if a decision is taken to demolish Northolt and build new homes on BWF?**

Answer	Responses
Yes	57 (53%)
No	8 (7%)
‘Don’t know’ or no response	43 (40%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>108 (100%)</b>

The vast majority of residents of those who answered this question (57 out of 65 respondents or 88%) supported this proposal

The BFRA also supported this proposal.

**Please give us the reasons for your answer and any further comments you have in the box below.**

Most residents supported the Right to Return for resident leaseholders and those that cited a reason explained that the reason for their decision was that leaseholders had not chosen to leave and were part of the community.

The BFRA commented that they should not be asked to move to a smaller property as a result of any demolition, and that residents should remain top priority until they receive a new home.

The BFRA explained that:

*“We want leaseholders to have a guaranteed right to an equity loan, the council should not oblige leaseholders who want the right to return to take a shared ownership property”.*

**Do you have any comments about these payments for secure tenants?**

While the responses were all in favour of the payments, a frequent comment was that the money should be paid in advance of moving to help the resident move. Early responses seemed to indicate that residents believed that the lump sum payments was to cover moving costs which are actually covered by the disturbance payments.

The BFRA responded that Home Loss should be paid regardless of the decision made on the future of each block and that rent arrears should not be deducted from this payment.

**Do you think that the Council should offer a higher equity loan in some circumstances, if there is a compelling reason based on a leaseholder's circumstances?**

Answer	Responses
Yes	46 (43%)
No	8 (7%)
'Don't know' or no response	54 (50%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>108 (100%)</b>

The vast majority of residents who answered this question (46 out of 54 respondents or 85%) supported this proposal.

The BFRA responded that a higher equity loan should be offered.

**Are there any other commitments which you think the Council should be offering resident leaseholders?**

9 residents provided additional commitments which focused on a higher valuation of the leaseholder's property, usually for the offers to be enough for them to purchase a new home in the area.

The BFRA responded that

*"It is not clear that a 40% equity loan will be high enough for leaseholders to buy a new flat in Haringey. If a leaseholder cannot get a mortgage up to the level required to buy a reasonable replacement property, then the Council must provide an additional loan"*

**Do you have any other comments on the Council's rehousing commitments as set out in the draft policy?**

The responses to this question raised similar concern to the comments made in earlier sections, namely that tenants should be allowed to bid for new homes, leaseholders should receive an increased offer.

The BFRA responded that

*"We want guarantees that any new flats built will not have a smaller floor size than existing flats in Tangmere with the same number of bedrooms. So, for example, a newly built 3-bedroom flat should not have a smaller floor size than an existing 3-bedroom flat in Tangmere".*

## **CONSULTATION ON THE BROADWATER FARM LOCAL LETTINGS POLICY**

A fourth consultation was carried out which was on a proposed Local Lettings Policy which would set out that tenants leaving BWF would have priority for future voids, and any new built replacement homes.

Three questions were asked in this consultation.

### **Do you agree that tenants who need to move off BWF because of the structural issues should be given priority for any homes that become vacant on BWF?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Yes	84 (78%)
No	9 (8%)
'Don't know' or no response	15 (14%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>108 (100%)</b>

The vast majority of residents who answered this question (84 out of 93 respondents or 90%) supported this proposal.

The BFRA supported this proposal

### **Do you agree with these priorities?**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Yes	86 (80%)
No	6 (6%)
'Don't know' or no response	16 (15%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>108 (100%)*</b>

*\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding*

The vast majority of residents who answered this question (86 out of 92 respondents or 93%) supported this proposal.

The BFRA supported these priorities.

### **If you have any further comments, please write them below.**

Responses to this questions were generally about the rehousing offer generally and concern about the offer they would receive rather than the Local Lettings Policy. Three leaseholders with the same typed response suggested that

*“Leaseholders should be entitled to council properties during the transition period. The council should waive any rental charges to the leaseholders”.*

The BFRA commented that;

*“Any out of pocket expenses incurred by residents while being away from Broadwater Farm before right to return should be taken into account and compensation agreed, for example for extra travel expenses.”*

## **DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS**

The tables below show the Sex, Age Disability, Ethnicity and Religion of those who responded to the consultations and compares this to the data held for Tangmere and Northolt residents. These tables do not include the response received two weeks after the consultation closed.

Respondents were also asked about Sexual Orientation, Gender reassignment and whether they were a Refugee or Asylum Seeker. The responses to these questions are not reported below as this data is unavailable or unknown for residents and the provision of data may lead to individuals being identified.

## Sex

Gender	% of all responses	% of all residents
Female	31%	42%
Male	33%	55%
No response /not known	36%	2%-
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%*</b>	<b>100%*</b>

\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding

## Age

Age	% of all responses	% of all residents
Under 44	18%	24%
45 to 64	28%	43%
65 or over	29%	25%
No response /not known	26%	8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%*</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding

## Disability

Disability	% of all responses	% of all residents
Physical disability or Mental ill health	32%	9%
No disability	19%	33%
No response /not known	48%	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%*</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding

## Ethnicity

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>% of all responses</b>	<b>% of all residents</b>
Asian	2%	4%
Black	36%	47%
Chinese or other	3%	9%
Mixed	8%	2%
White	23%	27%
No response /not known	28%	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%*</b>

*\* Percentages above do not add up to 100% due to rounding*

## **Religion**

<b>Religion</b>	<b>% of all responses</b>	<b>% of all residents</b>
Christian	32%	28%
Muslim	20%	16%
No Religion	6%	7%
Other	-	2%
No response / not known	42%	46%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>