

## Social Life activities on Cressingham Gardens, July 2013 to February 2015

### 1 Initial research: how residents feel about the estate and the prospect of regeneration? July to September 2013

Social Life carried out interviews with 109 residents, exploring what they like about the estate and what they would change. This included conversations with 61 tenants, 23 leaseholders and 7 freeholders, including people living across the different blocks on the estate.

Interviews ranged from in-depth discussions, lasting up to 2 hours, and shorter 5 to 10 minute conversations. Open questions were asked and coded using qualitative research methods.

At the end of interviews, residents were told about the planned Taskforce process and asked whether they would be interesting in participating.

Social Life attended several TRA meetings to explain the process and the plan to carry out a "co-production" process where residents would work alongside the council shape the options for the future of the estate.

Social Life spoke to a further 50 residents during this time about the process. These people did not want to be interviewed but gave contact details for further information, they were also told about the Taskforce process.

The findings were published as an exhibition, and also as a booklet which was distributed to every household on the estate.

#### **Exhibition/Sunday Lunch: 20<sup>th</sup> October**

32 residents attended, 10 council tenants, 10 leaseholders, 5 freeholders and 7 of unknown tenure.

Roland Karthaus used the event to ask for feedback about the shared spaces on the estate, using his birds eye view map.

Social Life spoke to residents about the planned Taskforce process (dates for four meetings were given from 10<sup>th</sup> December 2013 to 4<sup>th</sup> February 2014), encouraging them to attend.

### 2 First planned Taskforce meetings

#### **Taskforce 1: 10<sup>th</sup> November, 7-8pm at the Rotunda**

This was an introductory meeting about the process as the results of the estate survey and the financial assessment were not available.

26 residents attended: 14 tenants, 6 leaseholders, 4 freeholders and two private tenants.

*Lambeth Council used the time planned for the second taskforce meeting on January 6<sup>th</sup> 2014 to speak to residents about the results of the TALL survey and to announce the project team.*

**Late in January:** a new set of four Taskforce dates announced from 12<sup>th</sup> February to 16<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

**Early February:** all Taskforce meetings postponed because information about the financial situation was not yet available.

### **3 November 2014 process reconvened**

Meetings were now described as “workshops”, to differentiate them from the planned meetings in the past. The aim was still to run a co-design process.

Six workshops were ran in total, plus a feedback session from the six working groups that had been set up to explore particular issues in depth.

In total 102 residents were involved in this process, either attending workshops or working groups. This included 52 council tenants, 41 home owners and 1 private tenants. This is approximately 40% of home owners, and a significant proportion of resident home owners, and 25% of council tenants living on the estate.

**November 7<sup>th</sup>:** two workshops (afternoon and evening)

60 residents came to the two workshops. From the information they gave on that date, 23 were council tenants, 24 leaseholders or freeholders, and 1 private tenant (12 people did not give us this information on the day). After looking back at our contact list we have revised this to 28 leaseholders, 30 tenants, 1 private tenant and one person of unknown tenure.

The process was explained. Residents discussed what criteria should be used to assess the options (these are in a separate document). Residents gave feedback on the four initial options (see also below), Lambeth officers and members explained their thinking to date.

**November 22<sup>nd</sup>:** two workshops, one for tenants (am) and for leaseholders (pm).

60 residents came to the two workshops, 25 council tenants to the morning workshop and 35 homeowners in the afternoon.

These workshops gave information about residents position should their homes be demolished. They were another opportunity to give feedback about the initial options.

**December 10<sup>th</sup>:** two workshops for council tenants (pm and evening)

11 council tenants attended these sessions (plus one leaseholder)

The same format as the November 22<sup>nd</sup> workshops were used. The aim of these workshops was to give more council tenants the opportunity to attend, as their attendance had been lower than homeowner attendance to date.

Lambeth and the Independent Residents Advisor also organized a visit to Stockwell Park estate on 10<sup>th</sup> December, 10 residents attended this - 9 council tenants and one leaseholders. This ran at the same time as the afternoon workshop.

**January 19<sup>th</sup>:** Feedback Session for Working Groups (evening)

40 residents attended: 17 council tenants, 18 homeowners Leaseholders and 5 of unknown tenure.

This was an opportunity for working groups to give feedback and discuss conclusions and recommendations and how these fit together.

**January 31<sup>st</sup>:** final workshop was planned but cancelled.

**A series of working groups was also convened**

The membership of the three convened by Roland Karthaus and Social Life are below.

#### **Resident management**

Overall membership: 4 tenants, 5 home owners, 1 private tenant

Working group meeting 1: 2 tenants, 2 home owners

This group met once in January and visited WECH (Walterton and Elgin Community Homes). A meeting was planned, and external experts invited, however residents did not attend the meeting as it clashed with another event.

#### **Wellbeing**

Overall membership: 5 tenants, 4 home owners, 1 private tenant

Working group meeting 1: 4 tenants, 1 home owner

Working group meeting 2: 3 tenants, 1 home owner

This group met three times in December and January.

The group asked Social Life to investigate how levels of wellbeing on Cressingham could be valued, and to assess the levels of vulnerability on the estate. A report was written about this.

The group recommended that Lambeth involve SLAM, using their mental wellbeing assessment methodology, in work going forward. They also wanted the wellbeing valuation work to be taken account in assessing options for the future of the estate, and would like a wellbeing assessment to be made of each option. They would also like the aspects of life on Cressingham Gardens that are outlined in Social Life's report to be recognised and valued in the regeneration process, and that anything that undermines resident wellbeing in the regeneration process is minimized.

#### **Green retrofitting**

Overall membership: 3 tenants, 7 home owners, 1 private tenant

Working group meeting 1: 1 tenant, 3 home owners

Working group meeting 2: 1 tenant, 3 home owners

This group met twice, and worked with Sturgis consultants. A further meeting to progress discussions with Lambeth Living is planned.

#### **Feedback on options**

Social Life asked residents who attended workshops to indicate their views of the different indicative options developed by Roland Karthaus.

### Tenants views at workshops/information sessions 22<sup>nd</sup> November and 10<sup>th</sup> December

	Very good	Good	OK	Bad	Very bad	Total		% good or very good	% OK	% bad or very bad
OPTION 1	16	0	5	1	1	23		70%	22%	9%
OPTION 2	6	4	3	2	10	25		40%	12%	48%
OPTION 3	2	1	5	3	10	21		14%	24%	62%
OPTION 4	0	1	6	1	15	23		4%	26%	70%
OPTION 5	2	1	3	0	19	25		12%	12%	76%

22nd November, 17 forms filled in, 10th December, 8 forms filled in

### Homeowners views at workshop/information sessions 22<sup>nd</sup> November

	Very good	Good	OK	Bad	Very bad	Total		% good or very good	% OK	% bad or very bad
OPTION 1	5			1		6		83%	0	20%
OPTION 2	1	2	3		1	7		43%	43%	14%
OPTION 3		1	1	1	4	7		14%	14%	71%
OPTION 4		1	1	1	4	7		14%	14%	71%
OPTION 5		1			6	7		14%	0	86%

7 forms filled in

### Residents views at workshops 7<sup>th</sup> November

	Very good	Good	OK	Bad	Very bad	Total		% good or very good	% OK	% bad or very bad
OPTION 1	30	3	6	2	1	42		79%	15%	7%
OPTION 2	3	3	16	4	14	40		15%	40%	45%
OPTION 3	0	3	9	9	19	40		8%	23%	70%
OPTION 4	3	1	9	4	25	42		10%	21%	69%
OPTION 5	3	1	2	5	33	44		9%	5%	86%

44 forms filled in.