

**Name of meeting:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> February 2021  
**Title of report:** Consultation with tenants of Berry Brow/Buxton House: Remediation/refurbishment or Demolition and New Build  
 Consultation with tenants of Harold Wilson Court: Fire safety improvements; Sprinkler/EWI/Compartmentation

**Purpose of report:** this report asks the Cabinet to consider and approve the proposal to commence consultation with tenants at Berry Brow and Buxton House to address the fire safety issues based on the following options:

1. Design, develop and invest in a remediation, refurbishment and remodelling strategy
2. Design, develop and deliver a demolition and new build housing solution

This report further asks Cabinet to consider and approve the proposal to commence consultation with tenants at Harold Wilson Court advising of the intention to undertake major fire safety improvements

The impact of Grenfell, long term investment, low demand, wayleave restrictions and the emergence of the town centre blue-print, further taking into account ongoing fire safety investigations, the recent discovery of flammable insulation to the external walls of Berry Brow and Harold Wilson Court; the resulting introduction of a Waking Watch (which means a 24/7 fire safety patrol on an ongoing basis on a detailed specification based on guidance from the National Fire Service); and taking into account ongoing work to establish options for the long term use of Berry Brow and Buxton House, have all prompted a detailed review of each building resulting in a consideration for the long term use.

All consultations will run concurrently

<b>Key Decision - Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?</b>	<b>Yes</b>  Spending in excess of £250k and affects all electoral wards
<b>Key Decision - Is it in the <u>Council's Forward Plan (key decisions and private reports)</u>?</b>	<b>Key Decision - Yes</b> <b>Public Report - Yes</b> <b>Private Appendix - No</b>
<b>The Decision - Is it eligible for call in by Scrutiny?</b>	<b>Yes</b>  If no give the reason why not
<b>Date signed off by <u>Strategic Director</u> &amp; name</b>	<b>David Shepherd: 27/01/21</b>
<b>Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Finance?</b>	<b>Eamonn Croston: 27/01/21</b>
<b>Is it also signed off by the Service Director for Legal Governance and Commissioning?</b>	<b>Julie Muscroft: 28/01/21</b>
<b>Cabinet member <a href="#">portfolio</a></b>	<b>Give name of Portfolio Holder/s</b> <b>Cllr Cathy Scott</b> <b>Cllr Peter McBride</b>

**Electoral wards affected:** Newsome, Deighton  
**Ward councillors consulted:** No  
**Public or private:** Public report  
**Has GDPR been considered?** Yes

## 1.0 Background and Summary

- 1.0.1 Kirklees Council owns 4 high rise blocks in Huddersfield. All blocks are above 18metres in height and by definition fall into a high-risk category `HRRB` (High Risk Residential Blocks) when referring to fire safety guidance issued by the Hackitt Review (Building a Safer Future 2018) and subsequently the Building Safety Bill, which is due to be enacted during 2021. None of the blocks contain Aluminium Composite Material (ACM), but 3 contain an external wall system.
- 1.0.2 Following ongoing guidance issued by Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) we have maintained a focus on regulatory compliance while also establishing a golden thread of reliable fire safety information to keep tenants informed and assured of the steps being taken to effectively manage fire risk
- 1.0.2 We continue to maintain a rigorous programme of Type 1 Fire Risk Assessments (FRA), have undertaken a number of Type 4 FRA surveys to high rise blocks, and maintain weekly and monthly fire safety checks. This process identified flammable material on the External Wall Insulation at Berry Brow and Harold Wilson Court in November 2019. Early assessments showed a presence of horizontal only firebreaks or a complete absence of firebreak

In January 2020, MHCLG issued Guidance Note 23 which consolidated previously issued guidance notes relating to the 7 building components under review:

- External wall systems/External wall insulation systems
- Aluminium Composite Material Panels
- High Pressure Laminates
- Spandrel Panels
- Balconies
- Smoke Control systems
- Fire doors

In particular Section 3 asked building owners to update the Governments Delta system (MHCLG database containing dwelling information for each Local Authority) and provide `as built` information on the construction of external wall systems in blocks above 18m (HRRB), namely (i) the presence of potentially flammable insulation, where present; and (ii) asking building owners to take immediate steps to mitigate risk to occupants.

In response we checked `as built` records but were unable to fully establish the actual construction of the external wall system in the case of Harold Wilson Court and Berry Brow

- 1.0.3 Therefore, it was agreed to commission further surveys and from June 2020 AHR Partners (Independent fire safety engineers/consultants) have undertaken a series of more detailed intrusive surveys to each block to develop a Building Safety Case for each block, the results of which will inform recommendations for fire safety improvement and estimated investment costs. The Building Safety Case will also inform a wider options appraisal considering:

- Condition of the structure/fabric and remaining useful life
- Suitability of materials used in construction and methods of installation
- Effectiveness of existing fire safety measures, both mechanical and passive

We expect to receive final reports, recommendations and estimated improvement costs in May 2021. However, on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2020, following testing of samples of external wall render, we received written confirmation of flammable insulation at Berry Brow and Harold Wilson Court and lack of fire breaks. As reported in the briefing note to Management Team (6/01/21) this prompted immediate action and work to commission the introduction of a Waking Watch from 21 December 2020 at Harold Wilson Court which supplemented the existing Waking Watch at Buxton House and an ongoing CCTV/concierge service at Berry Brow

#### 1.0.4 The Waking Watch:

Waking watch was appointed to Berry Brow and Harold Wilson Court in December 2020. It provides 24/7 fire safety patrols on an ongoing basis. The Waking Watch has been appointed on a detailed specification based on guidance from the National Fire Service. This is in addition to the long-standing monitoring of all KNH CCTV and concierge service based at Berry Brow:  
Waking Watch Costs:

	<b>Monthly Cost</b>	<b>Annual Cost</b>
Berry Brow	£6.4k	£76.8
Buxton House	£12.7k	£152.4
Harold Wilson	£25k	£300
CCTV/Concierge	£25k	£300
	<b>Total Net</b>	<b>£829.2k</b>

We are in the process of re-procuring the service taking into account risk associated with a single supplier arrangement; long term service requirement; and resulting contract value. The contract award will be carefully managed to ensure minimal disruption to the ongoing service. We expect to commence the tender process by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021 and appoint a service provider by July 2021

#### 2.0 Key Issues to consider

2.0.1 In parallel with a continuing programme of fire safety inspections, repairs and proposed improvements, we have been developing proposals that consider the longer-term future of the blocks. Whilst fire safety is key, the cabinet are asked to also consider a number of other major factors. These are:

- The tenant satisfaction and feedback through a recent Place Standard engagement conducted at Berry Brow and the Huddersfield Blueprint engagement for Buxton House.
- Overall quality of accommodation and the council's stated ambition to drive better housing standards
- Sense of community, social impact, levels of crime and ASB
- Thermal efficiency, fuel poverty, the potential for disrepair
- Extent of communal facilities
- Demand/turnover
- Remaining useful life
- Ongoing repair cost, long-term investment and existing use value

#### 3.0 Assessment of Options:

### 3.0.1 Berry Brow:

The Blocks at Berry Brow contain 196 1-bedroom flats/bedsits, let on general needs basis, with 18 used as temporary accommodation by specialist agencies. All flats remain in the ownership of the Council

The blocks were constructed circa 1970 using a precast concrete frame. An improvement scheme was completed in 1995 at which point the current external wall system was installed along with other capital improvements



A cross directorate working group has been developing a range of options for the long-term future of the high-rise blocks at Berry Brow since late 2017. In March 2019 we conducted a tenants' survey using the "Place Standard Tool" (The Councils principle place-based approach) to understand views and opinions across the standard 14 themes (see appendix 2). We used feedback to finalise options based on refurbishment (including fire remediation) or demolition/regeneration. Indicative costs have been developed for each option which make provision for temporary or permanent decant, and home loss where appropriate

	<b>Remediate Refurb/Remodel</b>	<b>New Build inc Decant/home loss</b>	<b>New Build (Construction and fees only)</b>
Berry Brow	£23.15m*	£48.24m**	£42.30m

Berry Brow:

\*196 units retained

\*\*175 units built

No reduction of units

Potential net loss of 19 units

In all cases costs are indicative and include a number of provisional sums. Detailed site investigations will determine the extent of site preparation required to enable development. New build numbers are based on general massing and density. Detailed master planning will be commissioned to determine a feasible scheme and there is every possibility that this will consist of fewer units and an overall reduction in council housing stock, but will contribute significantly to the council's ambition to achieve better design standards and quality. BCIS will be applied to all construction costs once build dates are clarified.

In response to recent findings confirming the presence of flammable insulation, we are developing specifications for major fire safety improvements. Dependent on the outcome of consultation, the Council may undertake this programme either as part of refurbishment or undertake some aspects as an interim measure to provide fire safety assurance during the permanent decant of the blocks (costs subject to tender)

	<b>Sprinklers/AFD</b>	<b>External Wall Insulation</b>	<b>Total</b>
Berry Brow	£2.26m	£3.90m	£6.16m

### 3.0.2 Possible Scenarios:

Scenario	Decant period	Build	Maintain Waking Watch	Cost of works or Decant only costs	Total Project Cost	Risks	Mitigation	Benefits
Decant blocks while developing New Build options (assumes 100% home loss payment and maintained waking watch in lieu of interim fire safety improvements)	48 months	TBC	£1.5m	£4.9m (Decant only)	<b>£6.4m</b>	<p>Interruption of waking watch service resulting in increased fire risk &amp; tenant anxieties. Rehousing shortages; programme delay and increased project cost. Major investment with poor rate of return, causes disruption to council house building programme. Diverting capital investment. Increased capital borrowing. Site constrains; impact on development/planning. Reduction in overall housing numbers. Major site constraints leading to increased cost. Construction delays due to Covid/Brexit. Ongoing security risks and maintenance cost of partially vacant sites.</p>	<p>Re-procure service provider</p> <p>Work with RP partners to increase re-housing options</p> <p>Undertake programme modelling and reprofile capital investment to balance spend</p> <p>Detailed site investigations and adequate construction provisions</p> <p>Early engagement with the market</p>	<p>Reduced occupation fire risk. New high-quality low carbon housing. Supports best start and improved inclusive communities. Avoids abortive investment/ and ongoing maintenance cost. Supports place making. Opportunity to use MMC to achieve low carbon housing. Opportunity to introduce mixed tenure housing, establish local lettings policy and a good neighbour agreement. Opportunity to draw down WYCA Brownfield Housing Fund BHF monies for enabling works.</p>
Remediate Refurbishment/remodel Berry Brow	Overall 48 months (phase d/ partial decant)	24 months	£1.5m	£23.15m (includes decant costs)	<b>£24.65m</b>	<p>Interruption of waking watch service resulting in increased fire risk &amp; tenant anxieties. Major disruption to households. Lack of decant properties and delays to programme. Continued cap/rev investment in ageing structure. Limited place making opportunity and not in keeping with surrounding area. Future low demand.</p>	<p>Re-procure serviced provider</p> <p>Consider temporary housing solutions/ Hold policy voids</p>	<p>Quicker and cheaper than new build. Reduced fire risk. Improved quality/layout of accommodation and communal spaces. Improved overall look of the block. Extends useful life. Increased thermal efficiency and carbon reduction.</p>



### 3.0.3 Buxton House:

Buxton House is located on Albion Street in the centre of Huddersfield. It falls within the Town Centre BluePrint for New Street which was earmarked for organic residential growth and kick-started by the council's investment in the partnership to regenerate the former Co-op Building at 103 New Street.

Although Kirklees Council own the freehold to this overall Buxton House site, 68-118 New St and 1-7 Buxton Way were leased to Hazelside Properties (later Zurich) on a 99-year lease commencing November 1973 with annual rent at £33k rising to £178k by June 1994. The purpose being to support retail and commercial development on New Street as part of the city centre development plan. The lease includes an ongoing agreement which allows the council to lease back Buxton House and the adjoining carpark for a peppercorn rent of £200 per annum. This arrangement is due to end in 48 years. The original lease to Zurich was surrendered by mutual agreement in June 2012 and a new lease issued for 175 years on the basis of a peppercorn rent.



Demolition and new build costs below include provisional sums to acquire outstanding lease interests along with freeholds to all retail units and related compensation for the relocation of wayleaves.

The block was constructed in 1968 using a concrete frame, it contains 56 1-bedroom flats and bedsits over 11 floors. All units are let on a general need basis. Four flats are owned by leaseholders and 3 are sublet.

The block does not have an external wall insulation system so does not fall into the same fire risk banding as Berry Brow and Harold Wilson Court. Notwithstanding ongoing surveys by AHR Consultants, existing FRA recommendations indicate major fire safety improvements are required to establish effective compartmentalisation between the flats and escape routes, along with associated building works.

The impact of Grenfell, long term investment, low demand, wayleave restrictions and the emergence of the town centre Blue Print prompted a detailed review of the building commencing in 2019 resulting in a shortlist of options similar to Berry Brow, namely refurbishment (including fire remediation) or demolition/regeneration. Indicative costs have been developed for each option which make provision for temporary or permanent decant and home loss where appropriate:

	<b>Remediate Refurb/Remodel</b>	<b>New Build inc Decant/home loss</b>	<b>New Build (Construction and fees only)</b>
Buxton House	£13.1m*	£43.12m**	£40.82m

Buxton House:

\*40 units retained

Net loss of 17 units

\*\*154 units built

Potential increase of 98 units but requires significant land assembly.

In all cases costs are indicative and include a number of provisional sums including lease acquisition/compensations for wayleaves and loss of rental incomes under the lease agreement to Zurich. Detailed site investigations will determine the extent of site preparation required to enable development. New build numbers are based on general massing and density, detailed master planning will be commissioned to determine a feasible scheme and there is every possibility that

this will consist of fewer units. BCIS will be applied to all construction costs once build dates are clarified

In response to findings of Fire Risk Assessments namely the lack of effective compartmentation, we are developing specifications for major fire safety improvements, dependent on the outcome of consultation the council may undertake this programme either as part of refurbishment or undertake some aspects as an interim measure to provide fire safety assurance during the permanent decant of the blocks (costs subject to tender)

	<b>Sprinklers/AFD/Compartmentation</b>	<b>External Wall Insulation</b>	<b>Total</b>
Buxton House	£895k	£n/a	£895k

### 3.0.4 Possible Scenarios:

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Decant period</b>	<b>Build</b>	<b>Maintain Waking Watch</b>	<b>Cost of works or Decant only costs</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Risks</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
Decant blocks while developing New Build options (assumes 100% home loss payment and maintained waking watch in lieu of interim fire safety improvements)	24 months	TBC	£246k	£1.84m (Decant)	<b>£2.08m</b>	<p>Interruption of waking watch service resulting in increased fire risk &amp; tenant anxieties. Home loss and loss of tenancies to other providers. Rehousing shortages; programme delay and increased project cost. Major investment with poor rate of return, causes disruption to council house building programme. Diverting capital investment. Increased capital borrowing. Site constrains; impact on development/ planning. Major delays to land assembly and acquisition. Major site constraints leading to increased cost. Construction delays due to Covid/Brexit Ongoing security risks and maintenance cost of partially vacant sites.</p>	<p>Re-procure service provider</p> <p>Work with RP partners to increase re-housing options</p> <p>Undertake programme modelling and reprofile capital investment to balance spend</p> <p>Early engagement with freeholders Detailed site investigations and adequate construction provisions</p> <p>Early engagement with the market</p>	<p>Reduced occupation fire risk. New high quality thermally efficient housing. Supports best start and improved community cohesion. Avoids abortive investment/ and ongoing maintenance cost. Supports land-mark place making. Blue-print for future regeneration. Opportunity to use MMC to achieve zero carbon housing. Opportunity to introduce mixed tenure housing, establish local lettings policy and a good neighbour agreement. Opportunity to draw down BHF funding for enabling works.</p>

### 3.0.5 Harold Wilson Court

The block is located at Southgate, on the Junction of the inner ring road/Leeds Road. The block was formally known as Richmond Flats and constructed in 1962 using a pre-cast concrete frame and concrete infill panelling

The current building contains 44 1-bedroom flats arranged over 11 floors all let on a general need basis supported by a local lettings policy. All flats are in the ownership of the Council



A full decant and major refurbishment was undertaken by the Council/KNH in 2013 which included remodelling, thermal efficiency/low carbon improvements to the fabric of the building and capital replacements throughout. Given the level of recent investment made in improved standards, it is proposed this block is not considered for option appraisal.

Recent intrusive surveys have determined though the presence of a phenolic foam insulation in the external wall system installed during the 2013 refurbishment. Surveys further suggest that the installation has not been carried out in accordance to British Board of Agreement (BBA) certification that was issued as part of the warranty scheme. Unfortunately, the contractors issuing the certification has since gone into liquidation

In response to recent findings we are developing specifications for major fire safety improvements and have established provisional costs (subject to tender and BCIS):

	<b>Sprinklers/AFD/Compartmentation</b>	<b>External Insulation</b>	<b>Wall</b>	<b>Total</b>
Harold Wilson	£732k	£1.78m		£2.15m

Although we are not proposing to consult tenants on the long term future of the block, we must engage and work closely with tenants to undertake the aforementioned Fire Safety Improvement works and agree how this work will be carried out, in particular providing detail and assurance in the following areas:

- Why we are carrying out the improvements
- Timescales sequence and extent of works
- Expected impact on householders and how this will be managed
- What to expect when the work is complete and assurance around fire safety
- The fire safety arrangements while work is in progress

The proposed improvements will be intrusive and will affect the outside of the building, communal areas, and the flats themselves. Although we are not planning to decant any households we will provide local respite and welfare facilities if tenants are not able to remain in their home during the working day. We expect tenants to raise a number of queries and concerns so we are preparing a detailed consultation pack to clarify proposals and provide responses to anticipated questions



### 3.0.6 Consultation:

We are planning to undertake 3 separate consultations concurrently:

#### 1. Berry Brow: 2 options as detailed above:

Consultation commences: March 21  
Consultation concludes: June 21  
Report to Cabinet: July 21

#### 2. Buxton House: 2 options as detailed above

Consultation commences: March 21  
Consultation concludes: June 21  
Report to Cabinet: July 21

#### 3. Harold Wilson Court: 1 option as detailed above

Consultation commences: March 21  
Consultation concludes: June 21  
Report to Cabinet: July 21

3.0.7 Immediate consultation is imperative to safeguard tenant safety and continue to provide assurance, although we recommend consultation should commence immediately, we are mindful that we cannot currently undertake face to face conversations due to Covid and are therefore preparing detailed consultation packs and information for the KNH website and for delivery to each home in hard copy. We estimate 2 weeks' lead-in from the point of Cabinet approval to incorporate any feedback into the pack. Consultation packs are being prepared and initial drafts will be issued to this Cabinet meeting.

### 3.0.8 General Risks associated to consultation:

- Remote consultation may not fully engage leading to a poor tenant response
- Poor tenant response does not allow Cabinet to make informed decision on the preferred option
- Potential delays to final approval due to impending elections
- Shortage of project resource due to ongoing response to Covid
- Increases in procurement costs due to Covid/Brexit
- Shortage of supply chain for improvement works due to Covid/Brexit

## 4.0 Implications for the Council

### 4.0.1 Working with People

This is a major decision for Kirklees that could establish the standard of council housing of the future. The views and opinions of tenants and wider stakeholders are critical in delivering successful outcomes

Although we have not consulted on detailed options to date, we did undertake a Place Standard survey of residents at Berry Brow between 25<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 resulting in averaged 45% response. In June 2020 we consulted all council tenants and asked for feedback across 14 themes. In both cases quality of place and home was confirmed as the number one priority for tenants.

### 4.0.2 Working with Partners

A multi-agency approach is required for the delivery of the project, relationships internally, and with external partners are key to success. The Council cannot deliver programmes on its own; partners will play a vital part in shaping and delivering successful outcomes

### 4.0.3 Place Based Working

Consultation will inform a Placed based approach and inform a good understanding of the impact of the proposals on existing communities as pressures on existing infrastructure continues to increase. As environmental impacts are not really discussed with citizens, the proposed design of housing will be presented through ongoing engagement to ensure we are not creating dysfunctional communities of the future

### 4.0.4 Climate Change and Air Quality

The existing blocks house 252 flats and combined occupation use emits the following levels of carbon:

- Holme Park Court: 198 tonnes/year      2.02 tonnes per flat
- Bishops Court: 188 tonnes/year      1.91 tonnes per flat
- Buxton House: 104 tonnes/year      1.85 tonnes per flat

Existing EPC Rating (not communal areas):

- Holme Park Court: C
- Bishops Court: C
- Buxton House: C

Refurbishment:

Existing blocks are poorly insulated and have no gas and therefore rely on electric heating with high generation costs and carbon outputs. The proposed refurbishment will deliver significant thermal improvements to the fabric of the building reducing reliance on energy for heating by 40-50%

New Build:

We have an ambition to build to a low carbon standard using Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) and thereby achieve carbon zero for occupation, reducing reliance on electric powered heating to achieve carbon reductions significantly. Master planning will play a major part in establishing green space and natural habitat. The development is however `out of town` so transport links are critically important to encourage the use of public transport and adoption of other modes of travel. The location of the site presents an opportunity to build a `green` development of which there are a number of examples regionally.

Traditional construction will generate around 60 tonnes of carbon per unit whereas a number of MMC systems have established zero carbon in manufacturing and assembly. We will however generate carbon emissions in demolition, waste generation and site preparation and at this stage is difficult stage to determine actual impacts. We will however carefully design works to reduce embodied carbon where possible.

### 4.0.5 Improving outcomes for children

The Council's approved housing strategy focusses on early intervention and prevention of homelessness thus leading to improved outcomes for all households who are at risk of, or experiencing, homelessness, including households with children, and young people. The council housing programme provides a responsible approach for tackling the ongoing loss of Council housing through RTB and hence establish one for one replacement to meet increasing affordable housing demand.

## 5.0 Other (eg Legal/Financial or Human Resources)

The site is owned by the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and is designated for housing and street scene. Proposed development will be confined to within the red line boundary. Title searches will be commissioned to determine site constraints. Although not anticipated, we may have to undertake appropriation on parts of the site for planning and development.

The current 30-year HRA business plan makes a capital provision to invest in high rise blocks and therefore set aside £47m for remodelling. If the new build option is preferred across both sites, we may have a funding shortfall of around £30-40m based on current outline/concept plans. As we conduct further site due- diligence and design, it is anticipated the numbers of homes that can be physically delivered will be lower and hence the cost envelope will reduce. In the event the detailed cost plan shows the need for more than the currently allocated budget, officers will present options to Cabinet which could include:

1. Borrow additional capital against the HRA
2. Phased delivery of the schemes in order to manage the impact on the HRA Business Plan
3. Scale back other capital activity such as: Your Home Your Place or the council house building programme

Initial HRA remodelling assumes additional costs, based on reduced new build numbers suggesting £25m of additional borrowing plus grant. It is confirmed that this can be contained within the HRA business plan.

## 6.0 Resource requirements and costs:

Each phase of the project will require a dedicated resource:

Consultation:

- Berry Brow Consultation: 6 full time employees (FTE) 10-12 weeks: £0: existing overhead
- Buxton House: 4 FTE: 10-12 weeks: £0: existing overhead
- Harold Wilson Court: 4 FTE 10-12 weeks: £0: existing overhead

Consultation will run concurrently on all sites and although we have assigned existing officers to the project resource, we are mindful of the impact of Covid on staff health and the restrictions on a face-to-face consultations. Therefore, there is every likelihood that further resource maybe required to support this team and manage additional workload:

1 Team Leader G12 (6 months)	£22,735.00
3 project assistants G10 (6 months)	£58,065.00

Decant/Respite:

- Temp decant Berry Brow (refurb): 48 months £2.04m (In project cost)
- Permanent decant Berry Brow (build): 48 months £2.04m (In project cost)
- Temp decant Buxton (refurb): 24 months £0.53m (in project cost)
- Permanent decant Buxton House (24 months) £0.70m (in project cost)

Construction:

- Refurb works Berry Brow (24 months) £1.68m (in project cost)
- Build Berry Brow (36 months) £1.57m (in project cost)
- Refurb Buxton House (12 months) £0.53m (in project cost)
- Build Buxton House (24 months) £0.70m (in project cost)

With regard to the build options, Phase 1 early stage site investigations will be required on Berry Brow and Buxton House to inform feasibility. If proposed schemes are not feasible any associated site investigation costs will become abortive. We have set aside £250k in the

Revenue budget for financial year 2021/22 to make provision for initial site investigations and these will be later capitalised as agreed schemes move to the delivery phase.

## **7.0 Consultees and their opinions**

Supporting business cases and outline options have been presented to Senior Leadership Team, Portfolio Holder Briefing and Executive Team. Responses and views have been considered and taken into account prior to finalising this report. We continue to consult with all stakeholders as we develop the programme this ensuring feedback is used to shape delivery

## **8.0 Next steps and timelines**

Consultation commences:	March 21
Consultation concludes:	June 21
Report to Cabinet (result of consultation/preferred option/progress):	July 21

## **9.0 Officer recommendations and reasons**

- i) That Cabinet approve the recommendation to consult tenants and residents on the future options for the council's high-rise housing blocks to address fire safety concerns.
- ii) That Cabinet note and approve the on-going Waking Watch costs to the HRA at Berry Brow and Buxton House.

**Reason:** Consultation with tenants and residents is an obligation of the Council which provides a key opportunity to carefully consider views and opinions when shaping long-term high-quality housing and place solutions.

## **10.0 Cabinet Portfolio Holder's recommendations**

Keeping tenants safe is the council's highest priority and the options for consultation with tenants and residents offers long term solutions for the housing needs of these tenants which will provide a safer, warmer and higher standard of accommodation. Isn't this the reason? What is the recommendation of the portfolio holder?

## **11.0 Contact officer**

Asad Bhatti: Head of Asset Management  
Tel: 01484 221000 and ask for Asad Bhatti  
Email: asad.bhatti@knh.org.uk

## **12.0 Background Papers and History of Decisions**

## **13.0 Service Director responsible**

Naz Parkar, Growth and Housing

## **14.0 Supplementary information:**

Appendix 1: Listening to Berry Brow Mar 2019 (place standard survey)