



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.

[