



REGENERATION & RESOURCES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the meeting of the REGENERATION & RESOURCES SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on Tuesday 17 APRIL 2007 at 7.00PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Lewis ROBINSON [Chair]
Councillors Mary FOULKES, Richard LIVINGSTONE, Paul NOBLET, Jane SALMON, Martin SEATON.

OFFICER SUPPORT: Ola Agbaimoni - Assistant Project Director Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Department
Claire Brown – Chief Executive’s Office
Paul Evans – Director of Regeneration
Gafar Gbadamosi – Senior Legal Officer
Chris Horn - Special Projects
Lucas Lundgren – Scrutiny Project Manager, Scrutiny Team
Jules O’Mahoney - Head of Social Inclusion
Russell Profitt - Head of Peckham Programme & Social Renewal
Graham Sutton – Regeneration Manager – North Southwark, Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Department
Benjamin Washington – Chief Executive’s Office

ALSO PRESENT: Bernie Bartley – Golden Touch Jewellers, Elephant & Castle
Shamim Uddin – Elephant & Castle trader

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Helen Jardine-Brown.

CONFIRMATION OF VOTING MEMBERS

The members listed as being present were confirmed as the voting members.

NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS AS URGENT

The Sub-Committee’s Business Monitor and papers relating to Elephant & Castle Business Continuity were tabled at the meeting having been accepted by the Chair as necessary to the business of the meeting.

The Chair notified the meeting that officers of Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Department had been asked to attend to update members on the Elephant & Castle business continuity work. He intended to take this as a discrete item first on the agenda as there were members of the public present for this discussion.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were no disclosures made nor interests declared.

RECORDING OF MEMBERS' VOTES

Council Procedure Rule 1.17(5) allows a Member to record her/his vote in respect of any motions and amendments. Such requests are detailed in the following Minutes. Should a Member's vote be recorded in respect to an amendment, a copy of the amendment may be found in the Minute File and is available for public inspection.

The Sub-Committee considered the items set out on the agenda, a copy of which has been incorporated in the Minute File. Each of the following paragraphs relates to the item bearing the same number on the agenda.

MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the sub-committee meeting held on 6 March 2007 be agreed as a correct record of proceedings and signed by the Chair.

0. BUSINESS CONTINUITY AT THE ELEPHANT & CASTLE: UPDATE

- 0.1 Chris Horn opened by updating the meeting about the current work/progress. The Council and traders had been meeting as a liaison group since 2004. In terms of managing the potential impact of the scheme on businesses the Council, assisted by the Chamber of Commerce, London Development Agency and traders themselves had put together a Business Charter to advance the case of protecting business tenants in the regeneration area. On 30 January 2007 a draft Business Charter had been put before the Executive. The draft had three main aims: to help protect traders; to assist with relocation to new business premises near the Elephant & Castle and to help sustain local business sector especially BME business; and to maintain a balance between local and national traders at the E&C.
- 0.2 Since January 2007 there had been a continuous programme of exhibitions on the early planning sites. The process of selecting the development partner for regeneration was ongoing and included zero-carbon growth work. Several new developments were now underway including work on the Castle House site and two new buildings in construction. Works to the Southern Roundabout were expected to begin later in 2007. Development at the Volvo site was now underway and construction was about to commence.
- 0.3 The Council's liaison with independent traders had focused on how to put the Charter into effect and on finding additional trading locations for business. He felt that a Charter should be capable of adaptation over time to ensure it could evolve to meet the needs of interested parties. He noted that the tenant representative body at the Centre was under change, that the working of the Liaison Group required tenants to be represented in full, and that any such arrangements must have the full support of tenants.

- 0.4 The Chair noted that sub-committee recommendations in respect of business continuity had found their way into the officer report on business continuity presented to the Executive on 30 January 2007. In particular the Executive report now acknowledged the power of wellbeing and in addition some progress had since been made with the LDA in respect of a clearer statement of its willingness to discuss relocation packages.
- 0.5 Chris Horn continued that at the last scrutiny meeting the LDA had confirmed that they would offer business advice and more substantial financial resources to offer premises within the context of other development, this being discrete from E&C regeneration.
- 0.6 The Chair asked how scrutiny concerns about the Volvo site had been taken into account. Chris Horn replied that the Council had been required to leave space for possible tram development which was the reason why shop premises on Elephant Road on written plans were all above ground floor level. Chris Horn added that the Council was revisiting this issue and engaging in preplanning discussion on this matter, about which he would keep the sub-committee and traders informed. He was not of the opinion that this route was a viable tram route and that for this reason that Transport for London would be required to show more flexibility in respect of the status of Elephant Road.
- 0.7 Chris Horn reiterated that the Council wished to test the proposition of the arguments for business continuity. It now needed to discuss packages of financial assistance to meet the costs of moving to other premises without further detriment to businesses. Cllr Livingstone reminded those present that members' key concern had been the size of the units on the eastern side of the development and asked officers whether this would be resolved by reworking the development plans. Chris Horn stated that the units referred to were units on the "blind side" of the buildings butted up against the Heygate and that the idea of these units was that they would be kiosk type units, and as such were not designed to meet particular requirements of particular existing traders in the centre, each of whose businesses currently occupied a range of trading units.
- 0.8 Councillor Foulkes welcomed the professional advice but felt that members needed to be clear about the type of support offered, as referred to on page 58 of the agenda, which it was hoped would be personalized. In addition it was important that the needs of BME businesses were not assumed to be homogeneous. Chris Horn agreed and believed that the LDA was learning a great deal from its work in East London. He would be disappointed if the traders were not involved in development of this support.
- 0.9 Councillor Seaton referred to the LDA discussion in which he recalled it had been clear that the LDA needed firm plans from Southwark rather than mere proposals. He asked when a timetable would be available around which traders and the Council could then discuss the substance of plans.
- 0.10 Chris Horn noted that there were some areas of the E&C where plans were firmly in place, but the Council was trying to progress with the scheme in a logical and methodological manner. Plans might be revisited at the point of selection of development partners and plans possibly adapted. Developer selection was not time-critical to the scheme. At a single point in time during the scheme it was not possible to offer all opportunities that might become available over the life of the scheme, because it represented a long-term programme which would unfold gradually.

- 0.11 Mr Uddin responded that since the Charter was proposed years ago there had been much delay in producing the document on the part of the Council. In addition, the original charter was only three pages long, contained no new information or offer and was effectively the same as provisions within the traders leases. The Council needs to provide protection to tenants in its regeneration and not simply reproduce lease provisions. The many independent reports that had been produced all pointed to the suggestion that insufficient help was being given to assist BME businesses. The UDP inspector also highlighted this. The Council apparently was unable or unwilling to put a package together to protect business tenants nor give assurances to traders.
- 0.12 Copies of the reports that went to the Executive were circulated [see pages 111-149 of the agenda].
- 0.13 Bernie Bartley stated that if the Charter did not reflect the position that businesses were facing then there was no purpose in being round the table. He alerted members to the fact that Lloyd's Bank was commercially aware of general business decline at the current Centre. He felt it clear that his and other current businesses would not be in the new Centre. Shamim Uddin told members of two longstanding tenants whose business leases had recently been taken from them for non-payment of rent and who were now operating on a license basis.
- 0.14 In Mr Uddin's opinion there appeared to be no plan for trader relocation and he felt it inexcusable that the Council was putting traders in this position. He noted that traders had been shown a draft charter, then asked to draw a charter up themselves, but that subsequently their comments had been discarded. This had no other purpose than to confuse and delay matters, he asserted.
- 0.15 The Chair was pleased that some of scrutiny's concerns were included in the Executive report and in what was now being said by officers and that it was acknowledged that regeneration at E&C would have wide-ranging impacts. The question was what more scrutiny could do until such time as the Business Charter was evolved into a document that the traders could accept. It appeared to him that robust discussion between traders and Regeneration & Development officers was required.
- 0.16 Bernie Bartley said that until the developer came in nothing would happen. With neither firm judgements nor timescales traders could do nothing. He felt it reflected very badly on the Council that 90% of existing traders had experienced a fall in trade since regeneration plans were announced. He wished members could accompany him to his appointment with his bank manager to explain why a financial institution should invest in a business that was not expected to be in existence in a few years time. He asked why the Council had chosen to shelve Dr Mole's report since October 2006 and not to incorporate the suggestions made in this and other external reports, including the former report which suggested that the Centre could be used in other ways.
- 0.17 He asserted that the efforts of traders themselves had secured additional resources from the LDA and not those of the Council. Dr Mole's report suggested that traders were receiving legal advice which was not the case. He asserted that the author could only have been told this by the Council as traders would not have suggested this to be the case.

- 0.18 Paul Evans reminded the meeting that Chris Horn was acting in his capacity as officer of the Council and not as an individual and requested that direct personal comments be avoided.
- 0.19 The Chair reiterated that he felt that dialogue was needed about what the content of the Business Charter as the only to resolve the current situation. The issue was about controlled decanting and not the date of Centre closure and he felt that the Council needed to show more leadership on this matter.
- 0.20 Cllr Noblet noted that there appeared to be contradictory arguments from traders and officers and asked for confirmation as to who had been liaising over the charter and for details of meetings held to this purpose.
- 0.21 Paul Evans responded that there was continuing discussion with tenants, officers and the Chief Executive. He had been urged to bring forward definite proposals to the Executive to minimize uncertainty. He stated that a great deal of work had been done to put forward the Business Charter proposition to the Executive. This was the decision put forward by the Council and he acknowledged there were aspects of this charter with which traders would not agree. The Executive having given instruction to take certain action in January 2007, Chris Horn felt it would be premature to bring the matter back to scrutiny so soon and that doing so was unfair on all parties involved. The Chair restated that members had asked for an update on the matter at year end and that the current update did not represent full scrutiny as such.
- 0.22 Cllr Livingstone asked for clarification of the next stages of Charter work, the process for this and its timetable. Chris Horn responded that the Council needed to get into a position with the traders in which all parties could liaise with the landlord together on this matter and this remained a possibility. Collective pressure should be brought to bear on the current landlord to do more to maintain the trading status of the centre. The business relocation offer to businesses needed to be fleshed out, acknowledging that a firmer basis/offer needed to be made before any tenants could relocate. Consideration of the wellbeing power was necessary to ensure that the best offer of assistance possible was achieved. The timetable would be September 2007 at the earliest.
- 0.23 Mr Uddin stated he had not seen the copy of the charter that members were referring to, despite this being in the public domain.
- 0.24 Cllr Seaton remained extremely concerned that traders were suffering right now and that the landlord was foreclosing on them because they could not pay rent because regeneration had caused the decline of their businesses. He asked whether the Council might not subsidize their rent in some way to alleviate their pressures. Chris Horn responded that there was no legal mechanism whereby the Council could do so and that it was in the landlord's interest to maintain a working shopping centre at the E&C.
- 0.25 Mr Uddin asked whether this should be something that could reasonably be expected to be part of the bidding process for development partners that the Council had undertaken.

- 0.26 Chris Horn reminded the meeting that it had not been demonstrated that the 2004 regeneration proposals themselves caused the decline of a previously healthy trading area. Commitment to regenerating the area had been cross-party and spanned many years. He concurred that businesses had certainly experienced decline in trade and footfall and stated that he would continue to discuss this with the LDA. Paul Evans added that members should be wary of selectively quoting from papers provided in respect of the EqlAs item later on the agenda, which might lead members to make certain assumptions about an area generally.
- 0.27 Cllr Seaton suggested that a future scrutiny meeting might test the hypothesis that there was no effect of the announcement of the regeneration plans on trading at the E&C as he felt this needed to be proven to officers. Bernie Bartley stated that the evidence already existed in the form of the compensation study by Business Extra to support the assertion that trading has declined. A great many of the traders at the E&C had been trading there for many years, with people they identify with and with whom trust has been built. Traders felt that regeneration of the E&C would benefit everyone except them.
- 0.28 Cllr Noblet thought there had been evidence put forward that businesses were losing trade prior to 2004.
- 0.29 Mr Uddin was clear there had been a knock-on effect amongst the traders that started with the loss of value on a trading lease and which continued with the reluctance of people to refit their businesses. This reluctance was based on loss of confidence in the trading future, the regeneration plans for the area having been made public.
- 0.30 Cllr Seaton proposed that scrutiny of the Council as a potential contributory factor in the rapid decline of E&C be undertaken, involving analysis of the likely position of traders if regeneration had not been announced in 2004. The focus would need to be whether the Council was culpable. Members would need to discuss initial principles, decide whether the Council was culpable in this matter, then discuss compensation mechanisms available to mitigate deleterious impacts on Centre businesses. Scrutiny needed to ask officers on what premise the regeneration was based, which might include a certain percentage of BME business remaining in the retail area post-regeneration. If this premise was not clear then it was hard to see how the Business Charter could be tested. This process of scrutiny could be undertaken parallel to the ongoing regeneration.
- 0.31 In the light of these very serious issues, Councillor Foulkes commended officers for their work in putting together the package, but felt strongly that given the majority of businesses at the E&C were BME scrutiny work was indicated to ascertain whether the Council's regeneration schemes were racist.
- 0.32 Paul Evans said that the first proposal [from Councillor Seaton] would effectively be asking the Executive to reconsider its decision and could stop regeneration progress. In addition, achieving a sufficiently good piece of work on this would be a major enterprise. Councillor Foulkes was less than happy with this response, saying that had she posed this as a Council question she would not be told that the process of drafting a response would cause delay to necessary processes. The current meeting was an attempt to get to this bottom line.

- 0.33 Councillor Seaton was firm that his original proposition needed to be demonstrated to members, including whether the programme represented genuine economic, social and community regeneration or simply a process of gentrification. It was impossible to scrutinize the matter in the absence of firm recommendations.
- 0.34 Chris Horn reminded members that in the absence of Council proposals for regeneration, previous developers had issued an undirected and largely unregulated market vision for the area. In rejecting these initial proposals the Council then sought to mediate what the unregulated market would have imposed on the area. Selection of development partners was a means by which the provisions of this plan could be effected, and a way of putting traders into new trading positions that suited them and which enable them to trade was needed.
- 0.35 Councillor Livingstone concurred that it was too early to look at the success or otherwise of the charter before it had been either discussed or agreed. Some of the discussion around the issues would form part of discussion on the next agenda item. Work was needed to analyse the impact of the proposals as the Council clearly “fired the gun” originally. However he did not think that what was on the agenda currently was sufficient for members to determine and members needed assurance that some concerns raised would be addressed in greater detail.
- 0.36 Paul Evans advised that EqlAs did involve a continual process of reassurance of the impact on traders and others. That of the E&C would be brought back at the same time as the business charter to members/scrutiny in Autumn 2007. The Chair proposed that this be brought back to scrutiny including the business charter for an examination of at its impact.
- 0.37 Cllr Seaton reiterated that the external reports were clear that the 2004 proposition by the Council had affected the way in which all parties viewed the area and accordingly its future. In his opinion if this premise was proven the Council would have effected a most evil form of racism in that it would seem that BME traders would have been targeted.
- 0.38 Paul Evans stated that he did not accept the assertion that the Council had been racist in its regeneration of E&C. Ideas and discussion reflected in the reports were all common currency in public discussion around the regeneration, he added.
- 0.39 The Chair proposed and the sub-committee

- RESOLVED:**
1. That officers bring back to the next meeting of the sub-committee an update on the progress of the business charter and of discussions between the Council and other interested parties involved in the business charter, bearing in mind the 31/12/07 timeline for its agreement;
 2. That officers report back to the sub-committee at the next meeting on general progress towards regeneration of the E&C area;
 3. That the sub-committee keeps a watching brief on assessment of the potential impact of the E&C regeneration programme;

Councillor Foulkes wished it to be noted that whilst she agreed the above resolutions she remained of the view that scrutiny should examine whether the premise on which the Elephant & Castle regeneration programme is based is racist.

1. SCRUTINY: APPLICATION OF EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT [EqIAs] TO MAJOR REGENERATION PROGRAMMES IN SOUTHWARK [see pages 1-110]

- 1.1 The Chair reiterated the genesis of the item and welcomed the Regeneration and Neighbourhoods officers invited to present in relation to it. This item responded to member concerns in relation to the extent to which major regeneration programmes impacted on different sections of Southwark's local community. In addition, the sub-committee wishes to learn about EqIAs and to explore the extent to which they enable inequalities to be addressed in the context of major regeneration programmes.
- 1.2 Jules O'Mahoney gave a presentation setting out the main legal framework and national and local drivers for EqIAs, including the Race Relations Amendment Act [2002], the Disability Discrimination Act [2005] and the recent Equality Act [2006]. The RRA set out general duties in addition to which there exist specific duties falling on public bodies including the duty to produce and review a Race Equality Scheme every three years, and setting out how this activity must be monitored through the Equality Impact Assessment process.
- 1.3 Within Southwark Council the EqIA process now also incorporates all other five equality strands, which is over and above the legislative requirements. In addition, a new equality duty extending protection against discrimination in the provision of goods and services came into effect in July 2007 and will be further extended in December 2007. The basic principle underpinning Southwark's application of the EqIA process is a focus on tangible outcomes with the aim of equality-proofing everything the authority does.
- 1.4 In respect of the stages of EqIA, the first stage aims to understand the function or policy to be assessed and involves scoping the likely equalities issues around the function or service. The second stage is much more extensive, drawing on extensive external information and where necessary commissioning special consultation with groups identified as likely to be impacted adversely or disproportionately.
- 1.5 The Equality and Diversity Panel provides challenge and rigour to the process and comprises representatives from many groups. Responsibility for implementation lies with teams across the Council and the emphasis on training aims to embed EqIAs. The Council-wide EqIAs process is led by the Head of Policy, Planning and Performance's team.
- 1.6 Councillor Foulkes asked what percentage of Council managers had undertaken diversity training. Jules O'Mahoney offered to confirm the exact figure to date and noted that the results were published in staff publications. She was aware that the levels were very positive for staff above grade 14 [Hay scale] for whom training was compulsory and that a significant number of both managers and staff had undertaken training. Second tier staff in general tended to be in customer facing roles.
- 1.7 Councillor Foulkes felt that some of the Council's Equality and Diversity policies were good, but felt there was still much work to be done before the Council workforce reflected the diversity of its local community. She felt it was still rare to see such prominent BME leaders as Russell Proffitt.

- 1.8 Claire Brown advised the sub-committee that 31 Equality and Diversity training sessions had been held with over 300 managers, this now forming part of the development of very senior Council managers.
- 1.9 Councillor Livingstone felt that this training should be rolled out to all Council staff and asked what plans existed for this. Jules O'Mahoney replied that all new staff receive training as part of induction. The Corporate Learning and Development Team was developing a course for the highest strata of Council management. Managers could choose to make this training compulsory for their staff and embed it within the staff performance management framework. The intention is that over the coming two and a half years all staff will receive this training.
- 1.10 In respect of the number of BME staff employed through regeneration in Southwark and the visual impact of the EqlAs work, Jules O'Mahoney noted the complexity of regeneration work. Also she observed the improvement in the robustness of the many projects that had been through the Equality and Diversity Panel to date. EqlAs were a standard way of doing business and were now mainstreamed throughout the Council. Departments themselves carry out the EqlAs and Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Department is reportedly in line with most other departments in this respect.
- 1.11 Paul Evans stated that Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Department had begun to adopt a standard EqlAs assessment model, in which a regular stream of work provided a means of continual assessment of the project. It was not possible to take an ordinary approach when looking at regeneration projects, given their generally longer-term nature and hence the unsuitability of a snapshot approach. Acknowledgement of the particular nature and management demands of the changing situation represented by a regeneration programme was essential. High levels of discussion about cases for change are subject to equally valid assessment as part of the development of the London Plan. The question remains how to understand the baseline, how to assess the impact on people currently living in regeneration areas and to identify what opportunities regeneration provides to make provision for different groups in London's community. The Elephant and Castle programme is a 15 year project which will likely bring great changes to the area's current population.
- 1.12 Some of the issues and impacts would directly bear down on the individual, for example traders. Likewise with people's homes the offer must be put across in terms of what benefits the changes might offer to individuals. The link provided in the agenda report to reports written by London South Bank University had been made by way of clarifying that in some instances it is possible to assess the impacts of schemes fairly simply. The LSBU report looked at how similar potential impacts had been examined and addressed in schemes elsewhere. Southwark was trying to put all necessary components in place to take this forward, but it should not be assumed that the situation at the E&C would remain the same through the programme as it had been at the start. Mechanisms for impact assessment need to be really embedded in the programme for it to be successful, including training of staff. Southwark also tries to capture the process of regeneration from the inside as was the case with the Peckham Programme. Southwark has a higher level of confidence in certain schemes as a direct consequence of benefit resulting from the EqlAs process.

- 1.13 Russell Profitt presented details of the application of EqlAs to the Peckham Programme. A very large scale independent programme evaluation had been undertaken, based on a great deal of detailed information. In addition, MORI carried out qualitative evaluation. He explained that use of the Wavehill qualitative consultation database enabled the Council to track its progress against other local authorities.
- 1.14 In 1994 Southwark bid for the Single Regeneration Budget, at which time it was the second most deprived borough in London. The £60m resource was used to attract internal investment of £300m and the multiplier effect had kickstarted the local housing market, he stated. Initially, there were many dissenting voices about whether the Council should be involved in the SRB scheme. There were also public accusations of intentions to gentrify the area. 1994 was one of the first dates for the first replacement housing to be built. SRB was of its time in the sense that central government was at that time focused on the regeneration of bricks and mortar as opposed to having a community development focus.
- 1.15 Councillor Livingstone noted that the impact of regeneration disruption was not mentioned, although he felt it often adversely affected the very groups that regeneration was aimed at benefiting, through problems such as isolation during housing decant and community safety issues particularly those highlighted by the death of Damilola Taylor. Russell Profitt noted that dips in satisfaction levels with neighbourhoods and an increase in levels of fear often accompanied regeneration decant, although those reported in Southwark during the Peckham Programme were not disproportionate in relation to levels experienced in other areas undergoing the same process. The Council must pay attention to the detail and work with contractors to ensure that all health and safety aspects of regeneration are considered fully rather than minimally.
- 1.16 Paul Evans noted that lessons were at two levels. Firstly, in designing the process to minimise simultaneous regeneration of areas, although the physical nature of existing structures often is such that this is not always achievable, however. Operationally, therefore, one may need to increase support at ground level for example in respect of community safety, getting timely support to people. Inevitably, however, there will still be people who are last to be decanted from an area.
- 1.17 In response to Cllr Seaton's concerns about the impact of regeneration activity on schools, in particular whether class sizes were restored following regeneration, Russell Profitt said that the Education Department had kept some features in place and that class sizes were not much larger and ratios similar to before. Improvement continues to be seen in Peckham schools so it was assumed that this was mainstreamed. However, there were a number of projects in addition to which Lord Harris had recently announced new investment focused on support to stressed families. Paul Evans noted the considerable Building Schools for the Future investment in new buildings alongside and discrete from regeneration investment, the former investment having increased by central government.

- 1.18 Councillor Noblet asked officers to comment on the extent to which the delivery of the Peckham Academy and Peckham Pulse acted as a sweetener to local people and to what extent these added value to regeneration of the area? Russell Profitt responded that surveys undertaken suggested that people appreciated the improvement in housing and that a sense of place and neighbourhood increased. He thought that people would have appreciated housing improvement on its own, but agreed that other factors did increase satisfaction with an area. Paul Evans noted that Southwark had learned the practical and symbolic value of providing a key public benefit early in a regeneration scheme.
- 1.19 Ola Agbaimoni next spoke to members. She explained her overall responsibility for EqlAs of all regeneration schemes, and emphasized that consistency of application across the borough was very important. Due to the dynamic nature of regeneration, continual assessment of impact was vital. EqlAs act as a scheme audit, providing evidence which is subsequently trackable and auditable. The E&C had already developed its plan before an EqlA was carried out. The Framework for development for the E&C includes high level intentions, but still enables individual decisions to be looked at and their impact assessed, in addition to the overall regeneration plan and its delivery and implementation.
- 1.20 The LSBU review provided a strategic context and focus, and in particular explored the impact of regeneration across the areas of transport and retail. The study looked at whether regeneration was itself a market force that might disproportionately impact on certain people in the community. From SRB experience Southwark learned that baselining was not a standardised process across the UK, and therefore established a system to carry this out comprehensively. In respect of the EqlAs process, this tracks the key project milestones in the regeneration programme as it progresses. For example, the St Mary's Church and roundabout developments are currently being impact assessed.
- 1.21 Ola explained that officers were currently assessing the likely impact of not having carried out regeneration would have been for the E&C area, alongside comprehensive ongoing audit of the current regeneration programme. Those delivering the project were trained in EqlAs which helps to embed the process into implementation activity.
- 1.22 Councillor Seaton asked whether action is normally recommended as part of the EqlAs process where disproportionate impacts are discovered. Ola responded that EqlAs do provide information in this respect but that ultimately such decisions would be taken in a political arena.
- 1.23 Councillor Livingstone noted that Councillors needed to understand their roles in making best use of EqlAs work and felt it would be useful to see a timetable of forthcoming EqlAs. Paul Evans stated that EqlAs supported decisionmaking and accordingly advised members to look at the decisions taken and whether these were based on information available through the EqlAs process. It was noted that Prince methodology used resulted in a series of products and that if project timescales were stalled this would impact on delivery. In respect of the accessibility of EqlAs information, officers advised that Southwark's completed EqlAs were available on the website and offered to provide members with the web address.

- 1.24 Paul Evans noted that in respect of long term tracking of overall changes resulting from regeneration, including information available through other projects such as Neighbourhood Renewal, some central government information was useful. Information referred to in the reports on the agenda were internal documents useful in informing members about similar activity elsewhere in the UK. We can now look at what information can be appropriately circulated and acknowledge that traders were hurting now and that the Council must respond to this. Officers have information and he asked traders that if they had information to let the Council know so that evaluation of the current scheme could be undertaken. Officers would look at how they could learn from information already in their possession.
- 1.25 Councillor Livingstone noted that there was much to learn around community involvement including how to set up constructive community involvement mechanisms. Paul Evans stated that at the Aylesbury a representative structure had successfully been established and noted that officers had not relied solely upon this mechanism for 360 degree review, but as a way of more comprehensively adding to the baseline.
- 1.26 As an Aylesbury resident Councillor Seaton stated that there had been clear lack of effective communication and as a result open meetings had been chaotic. He felt that the fundamental issues around the Charter concerned communication and commented that the document needed to be accessible. He felt it unfortunate that all parties were caught up in topics that whilst fundamental could have been avoided through better communication. It was vitally important to capture the experience of community leaders and officers about implementation and for the community itself to take the lead. A community development focus is needed in regeneration areas, and any charter document needs to be appropriately differentiated for the various different client groups.
- 1.27 The Chair felt strongly that the officer/trader discussions played out at scrutiny at this meeting could have taken place in a different forum, and that further dialogue between interested parties was needed outside of the scrutiny process.
- 1.28 Councillor Foulkes stated she supported looking at EqlAs as they came through the system and asked officers to provide a timeframe for this as a matter of urgency, in order that scrutiny might assess at what points to examine them. She felt a further meeting was needed to focus on what scrutiny might explore in this regards and the mechanisms for doing so.
- 1.29 Members acknowledged the need for caveats to its use, but believed it would be helpful to receive a briefing on the potential scope of the new power of Well Being, in the light of the Executive's resolution of 30 January 2007 in respect of its potential use in relation to business continuity at the Elephant & Castle. The sub-committee noted advice from the Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods against scrutiny seeking to delineate the use of these powers in a definitive way prior to the Executive's response being made.
- 1.30 Give the difficulties in working around the live EqlAs process, the Chair proposed scrutiny look at the EqlAs of E&C after stage 3 and it was resolved

RESOLVED: 1. That the sub-committee revisit EqlAs of the Elephant & Castle regeneration after stage 3.

2. That officers provide information to members on request about the potential scope of the Well Being power.

2. **SUB-COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2006/07** [see pages 77-78]

RESOLVED: That the work programme be noted.

The meeting ended at 22:30.

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE:

DATED: