

Appendix B – Workshop Feedback on the draft Development Consultation Charter

Below sets out feedback received during a public workshop with residents held on Monday 25th March 2019 from 19:00 – 21:00 that discussed the draft Development Consultation Charter and the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

The event invitation was sent to the My Southwark mailing list which includes over 10,000 email addresses. 148 people signed up to the event and the sign-in sheets at the event confirmed that approximately 76 people attended, however, not all attendees signed in and it is considered that the attendance was more in the region of 90-100 people. The event was facilitated by approximately 15 members of staff from Southwark Council's Place & Wellbeing Division.

The running order of the event (attached at **Appendix D**) aimed to discuss both documents in two separate workshop sessions on the day with four key questions being discussed. The questions relevant to the draft Development Consultation Charter allowed residents to engage on the purpose of the document and also for them to give us feedback on the draft document.

Feedback was also received on the Statement of Community Involvement which is to be prepared, however, this is not set out in this Appendix as it only relates to the draft Development Consultation Charter.

The feedback received on the Development Consultation Charter is set out below.

Part 1 - Development Consultation Charter

Question 1: What do you think of the format of the charter? Is it easy to follow?

- The subject matter is too complex
 - o When and where – doesn't understand the meaning of the title
- The procedure looks complex
 - o better to break them into stages with details on requirement
 - o Timescale is not clear
 - o Need to be clear who it is for; how it is to be used
- Prefer plain English and visualisation for easier understanding
 - o For example, don't know what CGI means
 - o Also multi-lingual
 - o In the When and where section – reading the arrows from right to left are confusing
 - o List form would be clearer
- Lack of linkage with the site allocation methodology
- Early stage consultation is crucial, but need examples of good practices (in terms of conversation and consultation)
 - o The public has nothing to compare the plan with, they don't know how to set it into context
- Ensure diversity of consultees
 - o Reach out to more vulnerable and isolated groups and stakeholders
 - o Currently not clear on the list of groups who are consulted – more clarity is needed

- Who decides who is a registered/recognised consultative body?

Question 2: What do you think of the recording sheet with the information that is on the web? Is this the type of information that you would find useful?

- Details of engagement is needed
 - Which groups to be consulted
 - When and the duration
 - Feedback
 - Evidence of engagement
 - Conclusion
- Co-design process with professional support is needed
- Visual material requirement: to show the wider context beyond the development site (massing)
- Ensure feedback mechanism in consultation process has impacts on the outcome
 - Specific report on negative feedback is required
- Parallel consultation is needed
 - planning officers with the community
 - developers with the community
- Ensure feedback mechanism in the consultation process
 - Add a column for changes made after public consultation
 - Current lack of publicity on how to take account of objections

Question 3: What do you think of the requirements of developers for major applications?

And

Question 4: What do you think of the requirements of developers for strategic applications? How we consult on planning documents and applications?

- Pre-application stage suggestions:
 - Road map in charter is a good idea but earlier discussions are a must
 - Advertisement at this stage for community engagement should take place
 - What is the actual process of engagement? Clear line of communications between the public and developers
 - Who to contact
 - How to receive feedback
 - How to be involved/informed on the outcomes of design review panels
 - Pre-app should be summarised in full application to understand the initial consultation with the council - giving clarity of the pre-application process with developers from the start
 - If the proposed development is in compliance, then there should be a lower degree of consultation. If the proposed development is in violation, then there should be a higher degree of consultation.
- Application stage suggestions:

- To place greater burden on developers to demonstrate their ability to deliver, e.g. Project plan / timetable for residents including details of the construction management plan and post construction phases should be required
- Impacts of the development
 - Transport and other impact assessments
 - Accurate plans on height shadowing (with use of 3D modelling platform, virtual reality)
- Developers should consult using local community organisations with charitable status that have worked on planning and licencing issues locally to large development
- Duration & coverage of consultees
 - Longer consultation period required for major applications
 - Exhibitions that can cater to residents of different needs and timeslots
 - Requires the developers to invite members of affected community to focus groups
 - Consultation events at different times of day
 - Small number of people
 - Individuals are included, so that the group is not suffocated by local groups
 - To ensure diverse voices, clarity and transparency
 - There should be no difference between major or strategic applications in terms of level of engagement the developer requires to undertake
- Post-application stage suggestions:
 - Should use hoardings and website during construction stage
 - To educate people about the planning process
 - To detail some qualitative quotes from the community engagement process
 - Condense the vision and challenges of the application
 - To highlight residents' views of why this development/feature was a good idea - displaying people that look like me (e.g. BMW, elderly, disabled)
 - Developers should pay (around £7,000) to a community group who will externally monitor the course of the development.
- The practice should be more genuine, more than tick-box exercise:
 - Also to avoid consultation fatigue
 - How to evaluate public engagement?
 - Residents need to be involved in the evidence gathering stage of the process before developers look at sites
 - Working collectively with communities to validate the evidence that is gathered to ensure the facts about the site and the area are correct

For both strategic and major applications

- Clarity on:
 - information on S106 obligations
 - Enforce and monitor the delivery at post-planning phase
 - consultation plan and timetable

- Who's been consulted
 - Who's going to be consulted
 - Rules and guidelines on what is expected from developers
 - Backstories of the sites and developers
 - Necessity to explain how the application fits in and enhances the community
- Lack of information on viability calculation
 - Clarity is required in the charter for developers
 - Clearly inform the community of where S106 and CIL contributions go
- Council's support on community
 - Funding for neighbours to appoint professional advisers (locality) throughout the pre-application, application and construction stages
 - Residents are all volunteers, and developers hold meetings too early for full-time workers to attend. We lack resources that all developers have
 - Encourage meanwhile uses of the site during planning and construction phases
- Anything to learn from other boroughs?
- Multi-media consultations
 - Websites to inform consultation timetable and impact assessments
 - Interactive consultation on online forum
- Issue of timeline: 10 days is not enough

Further comments were received at the event that are not specific to the Development Consultation Charter, they will help inform the ways in which the Council works with residents moving forward. They are summarised below.

General Comments

- All new builds should be required to be carbon neutral.
- Officers should check if there are other planned or proposed developments nearby the application site to genuinely conduct cumulative impact assessments.
- Officers should document publicly the time and date when they visited a site.
- Officers should run workshops to enable individuals to understand the process of the council's planning structure and events.
- Officers should be present at TRA's meetings to address issues relating to individual's concerns and to provide information etc.
- Mixed voices: should developers come to council first, or to the community first?
 - Council first: ensure compliance with Southwark policies
 - Community first: council needs to consider local needs and voices and ensure transparency
- In relation to New Southwark Plan
 - A stronger plan is needed to be judged against the strategic applications
 - Currently (e.g. site allocations methodology) needed to be researched and re-evaluated through local engagement in order to be sound and legal
 - poor understanding of sites especially in terms of 'needs', 'heritage', 'economic networks'
 - By keeping things vague, the developers always win
- Difficulties in accessing online applications
 - Issues downloading the documents online, which normally takes over 10MB

- Hard to make contact with case officers and finding their contact details
- Community is divided by the attitude of both councillors and the council
 - Institutionally devalue community's voice through the current practices of community engagement
 - Imposed by different values, language barriers
- Value and protect the outcome of Peckham regeneration
 - Protect the arch and public space
 - No construction adjacent to the library that blocks the view of London
- Closure of bus stops at various times on the same road
- Ensure residents who lack digital accessibility can be included in the consultation process
- Update the list of buildings of historical, townscape and architectural importance for planning decision-making
- Documents should be provided seven days prior to an event so that attendees can read in advance and participate fully in the workshop
- No level playing field between community and developer
 - Especially on strategic and major applications
 - Community needs help to read, analyse and respond to highly technical and lengthy documents
 - Possibility of funding and dedicated planning officer with role of community support
- Cornwall Council's approach to early engagement was cited as a good example
- Requirement for all developments at the beginning
 - A facts report detailing:
 - land and buildings on the site
 - current uses and users
 - existing ideas and plans for self-initiated development by existing uses/users/owners
 - lists all stakeholders and their arguments or disagreement
- Vue City – at what stage does the 'model' get loaded on the 3D map? Will it be adjusted when proposal changes?
- Unbalanced development in Southwark - focuses on the north and central