

# Regeneration and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Friday 13 May 2011  
5.00 pm  
160 Tooley Street SE1 2QH

## Supplemental Agenda

### List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
4.	<b>Minutes</b> To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the open section of the meeting held on 7 March 2011	1 - 6
6.	<b>Community Infrastructure levy and the Greater London Authority</b>  This item is to consider if there is an opportunity to utilise the planned Community Infrastructure Levy to fund regeneration of Elephant and Castle station.  Val Shawcross A.M., Chair of the GLA transport committee, has accepted an invitation to attend and the London mayor's new transport advisor, Isabel Dedring, has been invited.	7 - 9
7.	<b>Peckham Town Centre</b>	10 - 12
9.	<b>Workplan</b>	13 - 14

### Contact

Julie Timbrell on 020 7525 0514 or email: [julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:julie.timbrell@southwark.gov.uk)

Date: 6 May 2011



## REGENERATION AND LEISURE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Regeneration and Leisure Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on Monday 7 March 2011 at 7.00 pm at Meeting Room A2 - Southwark Town Hall, London SE5

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mark Glover (Chair)  
Councillor Paul Noblet  
Councillor Dan Garfield  
Councillor Helen Morrissey  
Councillor Martin Seaton

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** James Hatts ; SE1 Forum

**OFFICER SUPPORT:** Julie Timbrell; Project Manager , Scrutiny  
Simon Bevan; Interim Head of Planning and Transport  
Jeremy Pilgrim; Property Development Manager

### 1. APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Columba Blango and Catherine Bowman.

### 2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 There were no urgent items.

### 3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 Councillor Paul Noblet declared a personal but non prejudicial interest in relation to the item 6 – 'regeneration of Peckham Town Centre'. The councillor reported that he worked for a charity that ran the hostel mentioned in the papers distributed as closed (later redesignated 'open' and published as such).

#### 4. MINUTES

- 4.1 The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.
- 4.2 A member asked for an update on Lend Lease coming to a meeting and the Chair reported that the cabinet member recommended the next meeting.

#### 5. REGENERATION FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

- 5.1 Members referred to the report published with the papers on Tax Increment Financing. It was noted that this opportunity has been conceived by the government as a way of creating value, but there are risks. Officers reported that this can be used to increase investment in transport, however it can be hard to calculate value in London because increasing accessibility to an area is a matter of degrees.
- 5.2 Members turned their attention the briefing on New Homes Bonus. It was noted that that the information in the briefing came directly from the CLG website and as such reflects coalition government views and policy.
- 5.3 Members asked for an idea of the potential scope of the scheme for Southwark. The Interim Head of Planning and Transport reported that the average council tax for Southwark is £1000. This would be matched by the government per year, plus an additional £350 for each affordable home, and would be given every year for 6 years. It is aimed as a reward for delivering new homes. Officers reported that the governments stated aim is to instil in residents minds that new developments will yield money. Officers noted that there is presently a target of 1000 new homes a year set by the London Mayor. Members asked if Southwark could deliver more, and officers responded that some sites will need investment. There are Brownfield sites and capacity.
- 5.4 It was noted by members that there are Registered Social Landlord's with cash reserves who might consider this an opportunity. Members asked if the New Homes Bonus applies to council housing and officers confirmed it did, and there was an extra £350 for affordable homes. It also applies to homes brought back into use.
- 5.5 Members were advised that residents do not always welcome increasing density. Officers commented that Southwark has quite high density in certain areas, for example 1000 people per hector. These levels of density work in some areas but might not gain approval in other areas. Members asked officers how extra homes could be realised in Southwark and officers responded that one route would be to raise density levels in Peckham and Camberwell.
- 5.6 A member commented that we need to think about the quality of life on estates in areas such as Peckham and any plans for increasing density should be considered as part of the Area Action Plan. The member commented that he was not convinced that this would be good for Peckham yet, and more evidence would need to be considered before this could be endorsed. There would need to be

evidence that raising density levels would be good for Peckham. Furthermore, he commented, that we do need to consider the wider implications, such as affordability and will people on Housing Benefit be able to be housed.

- 5.7 Members discussed forwarding this to the cabinet. It was agreed to forward the briefing to the cabinet lead for Regeneration and Corporate Strategy for further consideration.

## RESOLVED

The committee resolved to send the New Homes Bonus briefing to cabinet member for Regeneration and Corporate Strategy; Cllr Colley, for review.

## 6. REGENERATION OF PECKHAM TOWN CENTRE

- 6.1 Simon Bevan, Interim Head of Planning and Transport, referred to the report published with the papers; 'Town Centre good practice', and said that officers had looked at four town centres that might be comparable to Peckham.
- 6.2 The chair commented that Brixton was the most obvious and the nearest to visit, as it was in neighbouring Lambeth Council, and the committee agreed. Members said that they would be interested in finding out how Lambeth had engaged with big potential partners, such as Morrison's. Alongside this members commented that would like to find out how crucial transport was for successful regeneration and identify any barriers to developing projects.
- 6.3 Members discussed the East London line and noted that this will potentially link Peckham with the tube. Members noted that looking at how other boroughs have engaged with TfL would be useful. In the past officers have reported that finding the right person is very important as the organisation is very complex. Members thought it would be worthwhile to look at successful models of working with TfL, for example partnership work between Network Rail, TfL and rail providers.
- 6.4 The Interim Head of Planning and Transport reported that providers work on a shorter timeframe; however Network Rail has longer term infrastructure responsibilities. Network Rail own Peckham Rye station and related landholdings. Members asked how engaged Network Rail is with the council and officers reported that it took 3 years to agree in principle the opening up the square in Peckham, however investment is still needed to deliver the scheme. The committee wondered if they had ever attended a scrutiny meeting and resolved to invite a Network Rail representative next administrative year.
- 6.5 Members commented that they would be interested to see if Peckham features in their investment plan and commented furthermore that it would be worthwhile for the committee to look at the five year plans of both TfL and Network Rail.
- 6.6 Members noted that Wandsworth had managed to make the case for the extension of the Northern Line and stated that it would be interesting to understand how TfL had been persuaded and how private investment had been leveraged in.

- 6.7 Members emphasised that successful regeneration of Peckham is tied up with the broader vision of Peckham and work is currently being undertaken on this through the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan. It was agreed that the briefing for Community Council members should be circulated to members of the committee.
- 6.8 Members commented that we need to think about the issues such as the railway arches and the danger of development driving out small independent business.
- 6.9 Jeremy Pilgrim, Property Development Manager, commented that Network Rail have both operational and commercial responsibilities. The redevelopment of Peckham square by Network rail is dependent on its economic viability, either by leveraging in additional funds or rentals rising to a viable level; presently the frontage is quite low value.
- 6.10 The Property Development Manager introduced the 'closed' papers circulated to members; briefing them on opportunities for using the council's existing land and buildings to encourage development. He explained that some of the plots may become available, but they are not necessarily all on the market, and that this is the sensitivity, however he advised that the papers can be openly published. The scrutiny officer undertook to make these available to the public.
- 6.11 The Property Development Manager explained that the adverse economic market means that banks are still reluctant to lend money , alongside this the current cutbacks in government spending have reduced investment in housing, and as a result of this development such as Wooddene are unlikely to go ahead. He reported that housing and commercial investment go hand in hand.
- 6.12 Members suggested going back to partners such as Network Rail, Morrison's and TfL, and stated that this needs to been done on the back of the Area Action Plan. Any available funding should be offered as an inducement.
- 6.13 Members commented that the Area Action Plan has been slowed by the discussion around the tram and the location of the depot. Officers confirmed that even if the tram plan was resurrected the depot would not be in Peckham, however as the tram is not being actively pursued this should not hold up the plan.
- 6.14 A member commented that the Tax Increment Financing could be explored as a cash injection to kick start regeneration and deliver the Area Action Plan. Officers commented that there are opportunities; one is the Enterprise Action Zone that perhaps Peckham might form.
- 6.15 Members commented that a catalyst is need for the area, at a neighbourhood level Bellenden as seen a renaissance. In initial investment in the streetscape has seen the growth in quality independent outlets.

RESOLVED

There will be a visit to Brixton town centre before the next meeting.

The Community Council briefing for members on the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan will be circulated to the committee.

The committee decided to review Network Rail plans and then invite representatives to a meeting next administrative year to discuss progressing transport regeneration opportunities and Peckham Rye station in particular.

TfL plans will be reviewed and they will be invited to meet the committee next administrative year.

## **7. SHARD**

- 7.1 Members decided that they would scrutinise the impact of the Shard on the surrounding area, local business and employment and resolved to do a site visit. Members noted that they wanted to consider the wider economic impact on the London Bridge quarter.
- 7.2 A member commented that we need to think about the value of the regeneration and be sure that it fits in with our vision for regeneration. In particular we need to do as much as possible to ensure people in area, such as Peckham, can get jobs from the regeneration. The wider economic and social impact needs to be considered. Members asked officers to source any reports on this from the original planning process.
- 7.3 Officers advised that they could arrange a briefing and tour by Sellar, the developer. Alongside this they could invite a representative from the business community. Officers from the council will also be able to do a briefing on the employment training programme being delivered in partnership with Southwark College.

### **RESOLVED**

A visit to the Shard will be arranged for an evening at 4pm in April. The meeting will include a:

- Briefing on the Shard's 'Training and Employment Initiatives' by an officer.
- Meeting representatives of Sellar, the scheme's developer
- Attendance by a trader or trader representative to consider the impact of the Shard on local retailers

Source any reports on the economic and social impacts of the Shard that may have gone to the planning committee in 2003.

## **8. WORK PLAN**

- 8.1 Val Shawcross A.M., Chair of the GLA transport committee has accepted the invitation to attend the 4 May (later postponed to 13 May) meeting to consider if there is an opportunity to utilise the planned Community Infrastructure Levy to fund

regeneration of Elephant and Castle station, and other major transport infrastructure projects. London mayor's transport advisor, Kulveer Ranger, has also been invited. A briefing will be provided.

- 8.2 Lend Lease will attend the next meeting to outline their plans for engaging with the community.
- 8.3 Heygate demolition will not now be looked at this administrative year.
- 8.4 The rest of next year's work plan was provisionally agreed, subject to the new committee's decision.

[

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 6 May 2011	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Regeneration and Leisure Scrutiny Committee
<b>Report title:</b>		Transport infrastructure development needs in key regeneration areas in Southwark and the Community Infrastructure Levy	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		ALL	
<b>From:</b>		Barbara Selby; Head of Transport Planning Simon Bevan; Interim Head of Planning and Transport	

## **Key transport infrastructure development needs**

### **1. Elephant and Castle**

The area has a high level of transport accessibility; the key issue is the capacity of the northern line ticket hall and access to the platforms. TfL's preferred options is for a new ticket hall and 3 escalators ideally as part of a rebuilt shopping centre estimated cost £160m (TfL) The less preferred alternative is to provide additional lifts and circulation space as part of a renovated shopping centre.

There is a considerable gap between the funding likely to be available from developments in the area including the Heygate estate and the funding required to redevelop the tube station, whichever option is pursued.

There is a desire to continue the public realm improvements at the Southern roundabout by introducing at grade crossings for the northern roundabout along with redesigning the bus interchange areas, estimated cost £40m (TfL)

### **2. Canada Water**

The area already has good public transport provision and hence the infrastructure developments required relate to highway capacity improvements along Lower Road. These are likely to be funded through the planning process.

### **3. Borough, Bankside and London Bridge**

The area is well provided with public transport. Thameslink will deliver improved access to Blackfriars station and major improvements to London Bridge station. However there remains concern over the loss of the South London Line Victoria – London Bridge Loop.

### **4. Aylesbury**

Public transport accessibility for the regeneration area was predicated on the provision of the Cross River Tram. In the AAP a public transport corridor has been retained which could carry a guided bus service or be utilised as part of a revised tram proposal.

### **5. Peckham**



The Cross River tram was presumed to meet the requirements of the regeneration scheme. The only alternative currently proposed is the extension of the Bakerloo Line, although welcome this is unfunded and many years away.

The Mayor's transport strategy cites Peckham Rye station as being a strategic interchange location outside central London. This role is enhanced by phase II of the East London Line (see below) however access and interchange to and between platforms is poor as is the surrounding environment of the station.

## **6. Cross River Tram (CRT)**

Further development of CRT was not included in TfL's Business Plan released in late 2008. TfL's contention was that this was necessary because:

- Scheme implementation was unfunded;
- For the scheme to be successful, it would require a major re-allocation of road space in central London from general traffic to trams, in conflict with TfL's goal of smoothing traffic;
- Since TfL began promoting CRT, other schemes had been approved which potentially changed the transport need in the area.
- Alongside the new planning/policy context, approval for several transport infrastructure projects since the inception of the CRT project included:
  - Crossrail;
  - Thameslink;
  - East London Line Phase 2;
  - Northern Line Upgrade II.
- In addition, the UK economy had entered recession, with falling passenger demand and consequently reduced income for Transport for London.

In February 2010 TfL released its Cross River Tram Alternatives: Position paper. This stated that in addition to the above newly committed schemes, additional schemes had been identified which could further improve transport opportunities from the CRT study area, and will be considered by the relevant TfL mode or within the Sub-Regional Plans being developed to support the MTS.

Key schemes to be considered further include:

- Further promotion of walking and cycling, including public realm improvements, cycle superhighways and expansion of cycle hire;
- Continued management of the bus network to meet areas of demand;
- Station upgrades/improvements in central and south London;
- Bakerloo line extension into SE London from Elephant & Castle.

It should be noted that the only element of this so far provided that has an impact on the Aylesbury is improved frequency on the 343 bus route and one cycle hire station.

## **7. Camberwell**

Camberwell remains dependent on bus travel; options such as a new Camberwell Station as part of Thameslink are no longer under consideration. As with Peckham the Bakerloo Line extension if proceeded with would make a substantial improvement.

The step II major schemes approval for Camberwell Town Centre is welcomed and work has commenced on developing the project for further funding approval.

## **8. East London Line**

The East London Line is very welcome and phase II will improve access for Peckham and Camberwell (Denmark Hill).

There is support for both Surrey Canal Road Station and Brixton High Level to be provided. Both these would enhance accessibility for Southwark residents whilst not within the borough.

---

## **Community Infrastructure Levy**

### **9. What is CIL?**

- CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is a new levy local authorities can choose to charge on new buildings in their area
- The money raised can be used to fund infrastructure that supports development
- It applies to most new buildings and charges are based on the size and type of the new development.
- All local planning authorities can become charging authorities including all London Boroughs
- Normally the authority that collects CIL is the same authority that charges CIL. However if the Mayor charges CIL, the London Boroughs collect on his behalf

### **10. Setting a Charge**

- Charging authorities must produce a document called a charging schedule which sets out the rate for their levy.
- The levy is intended to encourage development by creating a balance between collecting revenue to fund infrastructure and ensuring that the rates are not so high that they put development across the area at serious risk.
- The charging authority can set one standard rate or it can set specific rates for different areas and types of development.
- The rates set out in the charging schedule must be in £ per square metre
- Charging authorities must consult on their charging schedules and they must also undergo a public examination by an independent person

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 6 May 2011	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Regeneration and Leisure Scrutiny Committee
<b>Report title:</b>		<b>Brixton Town Centre study visit</b>	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		ALL	
<b>From:</b>		Julie Timbrell ; project manager, Scrutiny.	

### Introduction

- 1.1 Southwark members and officers visited Brixton Town Centre for a site visit on 4 April 2011.
- 1.2 They met the Deputy Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Town Centres, the Brixton Town Centre Director and the Planning Policy Officer; who did the master planning. The visit started with an overview of the Brixton master plan and the Town Centre management programme and ended with a walk about of the key sites.

### Brixton master plan

- 2.1 The Brixton master plan was initiated because of concerns that it could perform much better as a town centre:
  - It has below average in areas such as retail and leisure turnover for a major town centre
  - Physical difficulties such as the railway lines have limited regeneration in Brixton and this has led to a general physical decline
  - There were problems with crime, grime and high levels of unemployment
  - Traffic congestion was a problem and there was an opportunity to develop Windrush square, widen pavements and change the gyratory system
  - A new Labour administration instituted area based strategies
- 2.2 The master plan process started with visioning workshops from summer 2007. It was reported that local people were keen to have their say and were very passionate about Brixton. The consultation process included questionnaires, workshop, road show events, discussion groups, a schools activity programme, vox pops and in-depth interviews at market stalls.

- 2.3 There were regular members briefing for ward members and the cabinet approved the master plan in July 2009.
- 2.4 Two key themes emerging from consultation - sustainability and retaining the unique character of Brixton. The community was concerned about the potential for 'gentrification' and a negative impact on existing businesses. Densification and overcrowding were also identified as issues, as well as potential loss of green space. Improving the quality of life for local people was identified as important.

### **General approach**

- 3.1 Sites with potential for development were identified, a retail ring was established and there was an emphasis on keeping momentum with early improvement to the public realm and the use of public art. Town Centre management was established.

### **Town Centre Management**

- 4.1 The Town Centre Management took a strategic approach.
- 4.2 The physical improvement and public arts programme have kept up momentum.



- 4.3 There was a major emphasis on perceptual change around community safety by focusing on the substantive issues. This was done by establishing close relationships with the large existing local police team and encouraging a robust approach to low level crime, drug dealing and street robbery, all of which were problems. There was a major crack down on drug dealing in central Brixton targeting wholesale drug dealers and street dealing. Officers reported that there has been significant success in reducing visible drug dealing in central Brixton. There has also been a focus on reducing street drinking by introducing an alcohol dispersal zone and changing the physical space used by street drinkers. This has also resulted in reducing crimes such as shop lifting.
- 4.4 A new public space has been created ; Windrush square, and this has had a very significant positive impact. The public space dynamic has changed; street drinkers no longer dominate the area and the new public space been added to by the Ritzy opening a cafe facing the

pavement. New buildings are planning their frontage on the green space. The changes have been funded through TfL investment. The new transport interchange has enabled safer, clearer routes through the town centre and better routes between public transport points.



- 4.5 There has been an emphasis on supporting and improving the covered market and its business units – this space is not owned by the Council. The focus has been on small business support, and this has meant helping traders to improve their business practices and assistance in resolving outstanding issues. Further improvements to Brixton's streets and markets are planned, with an emphasis on celebrating their unique character.
- 4.6 The programme has sought to bring residential properties back to the town centre by reviving upper floors of vacant buildings. The plan is aiming to increase affordable residential housing further.
- 4.7 There has been some interest from big retail business, including a MAC concession and a new H & M, but not a huge shift. Businesses reported that having town centre management improved communication, as there was one clear point of contact.
- 4.8 Network Rail development sites are planned for regeneration, particularly a viaduct site which offers a challenging, but potentially dramatic, venue for a cultural, retail or residential use. The East London Line will pass through Brixton; however it will cost £50 million to build a station because of the differences in level between track and station. Officers reported that the problem is finding the right person to talk to at Network Rail and understanding that they are economically driven.

## Regeneration and Leisure scrutiny committee work programme

May 2011

<b>Items for next administrative year</b>	
September 2011	<p><b>OLYMPIC STRATEGY AND DELIVERY PLANS</b></p> <p>Officers were asked come back in 6 months time and report on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outcomes regarding young people, particularly the number anticipated to benefit from volunteering.</li> <li>2. Links with sports clubs and facilities and any plans to promote these through the marketing programme and also challenge clubs to expand programmes and participation.</li> <li>3. Links to Fusion and the Olympics and any planned outcomes</li> </ol>
September 2011	<p><b>EMPLOYMENT AND ENTERPRISE STRATEGY AND DELIVERY PLANS</b></p> <p>It was agreed that officers would return in September to discuss the new delivery plans with Job Centre Plus and one or two prime contractors.</p>
February 2012	<p><b>TOWN CENTRE STRATEGIES - WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO CAMBERWELL, PECKHAM AND WALWORTH</b></p> <p>A follow up report on town centres will take place in a years time</p>
At relevant meetings	<p><b>SOURCES OF REGENERATION MONEY</b></p> <p>Any other sources of regeneration money will be considered, particularly sources of funding that may become available as a result of the coalition government plans. Officers were asked to report on any opportunities as they arise.</p>

TBC	<p><b>REVIEW NETWORK RAIL AND TFL PLANS AND INVITE REPRESENTATIVES TO A MEETING</b></p> <p>The committee decided to review Network Rail plans and then invite representatives to a meeting next administrative year to discuss progressing transport regeneration opportunities and Peckham Rye station in particular.</p> <p>TfL plans will be reviewed and they will be invited to meet the committee next administrative year.</p>
-----	---

**DISTRIBUTION LIST****MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11****COMMITTEE:** REGENERATION & LEISURE SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**NOTE:** Please notify amendments to Scrutiny Team (0207 525 0324)

<b><u>OPEN</u></b>	<b><u>COPIES</u></b>	<b><u>OPEN</u></b>	<b><u>COPIES</u></b>
<b><u>MEMBERS/RESERVES</u></b>		Press	2
Councillor Mark Glover (Chair)	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Councillor Columba Blango	1	Gillian Jeffery/Alan Ledden, Legal Services	1
Councillor Cathy Bowman	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Dan Garfield	1	Paul Green, Assistant to Liberal Democrat Group	1
Councillor Helen Morrissey	1	Steven Gauge, Liberal Democrat Political Asst	1
Councillor Paul Noblet	1	John Bibby, Principle Cabinet Assistant	1
Councillor Martin Seaton	1	Tania Robinson, Environment Dept	1
Councillor Helen Hayes (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Jeff Hook (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Andy Simmons (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Geoffrey Thornton (Reserve)	1		
		<b>TOTAL HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION</b>	<b>29</b>
<b><u>OTHER MEMBERS</u></b>			
Councillor Lisa Rajan	1		
<b><u>DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS</u></b>			

HARD COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE SCRUTINY TEAM Tel: 0207 525 0324