Southwark Council

REGENERATION AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Open section of the meeting of the Regeneration and Transport
Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on Tuesday 4 November 2003 at 7:00PM
at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT: Councillor Neil WATSON (Chair)
Councillor Paul BATES (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Graham NEALE

**OFFICER
SUPPORT:**   Robert Bollen – Corporate Strategy
Fitzroy Williams – Scrutiny
Stephanie Dunstan- Scrutiny

ALSO PRESENT: S P Crawford – Southwark Pedestrian Rights Group
Kai Rudat – Office of Public Management
Martin Smith – Project Director Elephant Links
Russell Profitt – Social Renewal Division 'Peckham Project'

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
Bob Brett – Chair of Elephant Links Board
Councillor Sarah Welfare
Councillor David Bradbury

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
None

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS
Councillor Graham Neale disclosed that he resides in Elephant and Castle.
Cllr Watson & Cllr Bates disclosed that they are on the Elephant Links Board.

RECORDING OF MEMBERS' VOTES

Standing Order 45(3) 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.

Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny Sub-Committee (Open) - Tuesday 4 November 2003

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 draft minutes of the meeting held on Monday 21 July 2003 and Monday 29 September 2003 be agreed and signed as a correct record of the proceedings.

1.   **Elephant and Castle Review: External Speakers Community Development and Involvement: Mr Kai Rudat – Office of Public Management**

The Chair reminded the Sub-Committee as to the terms of reference for hearing evidence from the speakers, as agreed to in the Report from OSC. The scope of the review for the sub-committee, as outlined in draft minutes 29th September 2002 pg.3, was to:

- Define community engagement/involvement
- Establish what mechanisms are effective for engaging with the community
- Establish what mechanisms for community engagement/involvement are in place as part of the Elephant and Castle project
- Consider the recommendations of the Peckham Parternship Study.

The Sub-Committee heard evidence from Kai Rudat of the Office for Public Management (OPM). Mr. Rudat gave a formal presentation that demonstrated his work in a range of different community engagement projects both within Southwark, across other London Boroughs and regional areas. He highlighted the need to effectively manage relationships with community stakeholders, and the tensions between effectively engaging the community at all stages of the regeneration project and the project management plans. He pointed out the difficulties of managing stakeholder engagement during regeneration projects because of their long time frames. Mr. Rudat demonstrated the number of challenges Local Authorities face when trying to manage stakeholder engagement during regeneration projects. (See attached presentation, pg. 11) He commented that he thought that Aylesbury demonstrated an example of a scheme where community involvement could have been more effectively managed and more could have been done to sell the merits of the scheme to the local community on the stock transfer.

The Sub-Committee asked Mr. Rudat to identify examples of good and bad practice stakeholder engagement during regeneration projects. In his opinion, good examples were Birmingham and Manchester regeneration, but he commented that often City

Centre regeneration projects are more successful that residential area regeneration projects, as residential projects are more complex. The regeneration of Birmingham for instance was centred on a "non residential" district where community consultation was minimal. Mr. Rudat highlighted that often an issue during stakeholder engagement exercises is identifying who the representative public are and deciding if stakeholders engaged in the public meetings are truly representative. Another issue is creating an agreed process for stakeholder engagement.

| 2. | **Elephant and Castle Review: External Speakers Community Development and Involvement: Mr Martin Smith – Director Elephant Links** |

The Chair invited Mr. Martin Smith to give a presentation.

Mr. Smith gave an informal presentation that examined some of the challenges that Mr. Rudat had given as applied to the Elephant and Castle regeneration project.

Mr. Smith highlighted that the Elephant and Castle regeneration project is the longest redevelopment project since the Docklands and will affect people not only living in Elephant and Castle but also many commuters travelling through the borough and the South East economy as a whole. He pointed out the initial problem between the vision, as presented by the original developer SLR, and delivery of the project. For example, the initial visual images of the redevelopment did not actually reflect what the redevelopment would look like or what was deliverable. He commented that the fact that the regeneration involved public housing made the community engagement more complex. He explained how the initial board structure allowed a small group of activists to became powerful enough to derail the community engagement and delay the delivery of the Elephant and Castle project. The board has now been reconstituted with the model of Southwark's LSP for representation. He suggested that the Sub-Committee examine the possibility of using mediation services.

Mr. Smith answered questions from the subcommittee regarding the results of independent audits conducted by consultants on the public engagement processes. He also answered questions regarding the best way to create a structure/model for public engagement and stressed the importance of creating checks and balances in the structure, which he believed the Elephant and Castle project lacked and resulted in a small group of activists becoming powerful. He commented that not all the Peckham Audit recommendations are relevant for Elephant and Castle, but some are and offered to respond to the Sub-Committee in more depth on this issue.

| 2. | **Elephant and Castle Review: External Speakers Community Development and Involvement: Mr. Russell Profit Social** |

Renewal Division Southwark Council

The Chair invited Mr. Russell Profitt to give a presentation.

Mr. Profitt gave an information presentation that highlighted the recommendations of the Best Value Review of Community Development and Involvement. Mr. Profitt commented that although mistakes regarding community engagement had been made in the past and that some mistakes may continue to happen there are lessons that have been learnt. Mr Profitt demonstrated that renaming the department to 'Social renewal' provided an awareness that renewal is not just the physical renewal but improvement to people's lives. He highlighted how social renewal issues are on the political agenda with the Office of the Deputy Prime Ministers producing many reference documents. Mr Profitt commented that the Best Value Review of Community Development and Involvement provides a framework for how the Council can progress on this topic.

Mr. Profitt answered questions from the sub-committee regarding what models would be most appropriate for community engagement in regeneration projects, commenting that there is no one model that is working nationally. Mr. Profitt suggested that Community Councils may be able to make a difference to community engagement on regeneration issues if they are given clear terms of reference for decision making. Mr. Profitt highlighted the difficulties of engaging hard to reach community groups and also recruiting the representative public. He commented that best practice community engagement appears to be occurring in Camden and Newham borough who have invested more strategically in community development. He said that of the recommendations within the Best Value Review of Community Development and Involvement, the Elephant and Castle team need to look at the recommendations and see which ones are relevant.

Mr. Profitt agreed to circulate the evaluation report on Peckham partnerships to the Sub-Committee.

Southwark Unitary Development Plan
Robert Bollen gave an update on the UDP. He outlined that the Council was not intending post the second deposit to take the UDP to Community Councils for consideration. However, due to new guidelines issued by the Government the UDP is now to be updated on a rolling basis and the plan would do to Community Councils one year post agreement.

The meeting ended at 10.20 p.m.

Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny Sub-Committee (Open) - Tuesday 4 November 2003

Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny Sub-Committee (Open) - Tuesday 4 November 2003