



## **REGENERATION AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY SUB - COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of the Open section of the meeting of the Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny Sub - Committee held on 19th November 2003 at 7.00 PM at the Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Neil Watson (Chair)  
Councillor Paul Bates (Vice-Chair)  
Councillors Graham Neale, Sarah Welfare, Billy Kayada

**ALSO PRESENT:** Stephanie Dunstan – Scrutiny  
Shelley Burke – Scrutiny  
Martin Smith – Regeneration  
Mark Patchett - Consultant

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No Apologies were received

### **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**

Presentation from Mark Patchett  
Request for Scrutiny from Mr Hamish Horsley  
Request for Scrutiny from Ms Janet Yatak

### **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

Cllr 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.

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

That the Open minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> November be agreed and signed as a correct record of the proceedings.

Motion proposed by Cllr Watson, seconded by Cllr Neale.

- 
1. Cllr Watson opened the meeting at 7.10pm. He advised that the Sub Committee would hear a presentation from Mr Patchett and invited him to present.

---

### **Presentation from Mark Patchett**

Mr Patchett introduced himself to the Sub - Committee and explained his extensive expertise in community consultation issues surrounding regeneration, including some regeneration projects in Southwark. Most recently he was employed by Southwark to establish the Diversity Panel for the Elephant Links Partnership and for a short period acted as independent chair for the Board and now acts as the independent Chair for the Diversity Panel meetings

His presentation examined the levels of public engagement that exist from Consultation to Supporting Independent Community Interests. His presentation stressed the importance of defining the Purpose, aims and objectives of Community Engagement and that a long-term commitment was needed to engage effectively. His presentation examined some of the key components of best practice and explained the basis for the Elephant Links Diversity Panel

### **Questions**

Cllr Watson thanked Mr Patchett for his presentation and opened up the meeting to questions from the Sub - Committee.

Cllr Watson asked Mr Patchett if he was employed by the Elephant links SRB team, to which Mr Patchett replied yes. Cllr Watson also asked Mr Patchett what he was asked to do and why the Diversity Panel needed to be formed. Mr Patchett replied that he was asked to deliver a new operating structure and terms of reference for community engagement. He felt that a diversity panel was needed because he had learnt that the existing community consultation structure was no longer operating well.

Cllr Watson asked how much interest there was in the diversity Panel. Mr Patchett replied that at the first meeting there were 60 and that at the meeting there was a sense of community spirit even though that there were some people with a defensive agenda. He commented that it had become apparent to him that there were very different levels of engagement with the public depending upon their geographic location.

It was asked of Mr Patchett how did he reach hard to access groups. Mr Patchett commented that it was done through a very large mail out to the public encouraging them to come and to also spread the word.

Mr Patchett commented that it was very important to adopt the public consultation to suit the audience that you are trying to reach. He gave the example of engaging with Youth and how it was important to change from traditional public meeting style engagement. In the example of Youth in Newham they had engaged with them through utilising Youth Parliament, allowing Youth to only come for some agenda items (if they felt like leaving it would be OK), and structuring meetings to make it interesting.

---

Cllr Kayada asked what had changed since the Diversity Panel had started. Mr Patchett commented that what was important was establishing the terms of reference for the Diversity Panel (which took 3 meetings). Then it was important to get information flows between the Diversity Panel through proper briefings from the Elephant Links Board, and also to get live presentations

Cllr Neale asked what structures were in place before the Diversity Panel, to which Mr Patchett replied that there were no formal community participation so the diversity Panel was created. Cllr Neale also asked why Mr Patchett had left as Chair of the Elephant Links Board. Mr Patchett explained that he was paid to be an independent chair for a short period whilst they searched for an independent chair who would not require a fee. Mr Patchett elaborated more generally on the importance of having independent chairs with no vested interests on the Board. He remains the independent chair of the Diversity Panel.

Cllr Watson asked Mr Patchett about how you can safeguard the independence of the chair and also the integrity of the members of the Diversity Panel. Mr Patchett commented that often in these cases, and is becoming more popular, to get people to sign a declaration of their interests. He commented that this currently is the dilemma of many regeneration projects as public members must decide if they are there to act as a representative of the public or are they there to act on their interests? Mr Patchett stressed the need to create an appropriate protocol to protect boards with the ability to sack members if they do not act in the

interests of the board. He gave the example of 'New Deal' community forums where these protocols are in place.

Mr Patchett was asked a question as to whether he felt pressure to deliver something new because time had elapsed. He answered that he felt there was pressure to get the Diversity Panel running because the community weren't engaging with the board.

There was a question from the floor as to whether community development was a specialist skill and if he thought the Council was integrating it well across the organisation. Mr Patchett's response was that the community engagement section of the Council appeared to be operating very separately but that was his experience of Southwark generally, that Southwark was very departmentalised.

Mr Patchett's concluding remarks were that it takes 1-2 years to set up and put in place the mechanisms for community engagement and it is important to spend time doing this. Community Capacity building is an important element of regeneration projects. It is important that the Diversity Panel continue to do with capacity building work.

**Resolved**

1. Stephanie contact Richard Harris to get a copy of the terms of reference of the Diversity Panel

---

2

**Recommendation  
of the Peckham  
Partnership**

Cllr Watson invited the Sub - Committee to go through the Recommendations of the Peckham Partnership. There was a general discussion about how to go through these items most efficiently.

The general discussion then turned to the terms of the reference for this scrutiny and the need to examine the recommendations of the Peckham Partnership in relation to Elephant and Castle. Martin Smith commented that he didn't think that there were many specific lessons that could be transferred from Peckham to Elephant and Castle because both projects were very different. Cllr Bates commented that he felt that the Elephant and Castle project was learning from its own mistakes rather than from the Peckham partnership, which Martin Smith agreed.

It was decided that the 4<sup>th</sup> point of reference for the scrutiny needed to be re worded to reflect how lessons regarding community consultation can be captured within the Council.

**Resolved**

1. 4<sup>th</sup> Term of Reference for the Scrutiny to be reworded and presented back to the Sub - Committee. Overview and Scrutiny to be advised of change in wording. (Action: Stephanie)

sd

**Forward Planning** The Sub- Committee had a general discussion about whom they wanted to invite to present evidence at future meetings. The list is as follows:

- CIDU
- LDA
- Community Activists (however a balance must be reached in opinion of activists. If only one activist opinion can present evidence, effort must be made to have a balancing opinion to also give evidence)
- Best Practice example of community engagement from Camden Council and/or Newham Council
- Strategic Director of Regeneration (Southwark)
- SAVO
- Elephant Links Diversity Panel

There was a general discussion about the fact that facilitating the list of witnesses above would mean going beyond the planned 4 meetings. It was estimated that this scrutiny should be completed by end of Jan 2004.

**Resolved**

1. Stephanie to contact list of representatives, check availability for meetings, develop plan for 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 10 December, 27<sup>th</sup> January meetings.
2. First draft of scrutiny report to be presented at 3<sup>rd</sup> December meeting.

**Requests for Scrutiny**

The Chair brought to attention of the Sub - Committee two urgent items:

- A request for Scrutiny from Janet Yatak
- A request for Scrutiny from H. Horsley

The Sub - Committee discussed both requests and the proper constitutional processes to receiving requests for scrutiny from the public.

The Sub - Committee were made aware that Ms Yatak's request had been formally made to Cllr Eckersley, as Chair of Economic Development and Finance Scrutiny Sub Committee, and that her request had both economic, regeneration, and consultation implications.

The Sub - Committee discussed Mr. Horsley's request in light of the forthcoming Executive Decision on the adoption of the master plan for Chumleigh Gardens. They also discussed that scrutiny is unable to examine planning decisions or proposals.

**Resolved**

1. Cllr Paul Bates proposed that this Sub - Committee complete a scrutiny on Ms Yatak's issues, and was seconded by Cllr Welfare.

2. The Sub - Committee resolved to contact Overview and Scrutiny to express their desire to undertake a scrutiny on Ms Yatak's request following this current scrutiny. Guidance from OSC will determine which scrutiny committee hears the request for scrutiny

3. The Sub - Committee resolved to formally write to Ms Yatak explaining how her request was being processed.

4. The Sub - Committee resolved to forward Mr Horsley's request for OSC for guidance as to if it was appropriate to conduct a scrutiny and where it could fit in the Sub Committee's work program.

**Meeting Closed**

Meeting Closed 10:15pm.

