



South Bank and Waterloo Neighbours
STEERING GROUP & WORKSHOP

25 June 2015

Steering group 6:00pm – 8:00pm

Coin Street neighbourhood centre

MINUTES

Present:

John Langley (Chair)
Ben Stephenson (Sec.)
Phoebe Greenwood (Treas.)
Amanda Faul
Jenny Stiles

Teresa Collins
Mike McCart
Chris Bagot
Michael Johnson
John Rushton

Ted Inman
Giles Goddard
Paul Dyson

Observing:

Alison Mara
Tom (Bellenden)
Orenda O'Brien Davis
Richard Bridge
Robert Hayward

Tom Weaver
Eleanor Bentall
Joe O'Meara
Sarah Thompson
Cllr David Noakes

Cllr Jenny Moseley
Cllr Kevin Craig
Lorraine Hart

1. Welcome and introductions

JL opened the meeting and ask everyone to introduce themselves.

2. Minutes of the meeting 26 February and matters arising

There were no clarifications or corrections to the minutes of the 26 Feb meeting and they were duly signed by the Chair.

ACTIONS:

Only action was **'BS to seek input from steering group members on vision'**.

An open group met on 23 April 2015 to develop the appended paper, which will form the opening section of the Neighbourhood Plan – key points:

- Summary of the aims of each theme of the neighbourhood plan
- Summary of the aims of the plan itself
- A 'vision statement' which sums up the aims of the plan in a single sentence

Group agreed that the term 'affordable' was ill-defined, and that further explanation should be given about affordability in different contexts (affordable workspace, affordable housing etc) in the body of the Neighbourhood Plan.

An explanation of the reason for the fifteen year life-span of the plan - corresponding with Lambeth and Southwark's local plans - should be made.

3. Update on progress and draft plan policies

3.1. Policy consultation completed

- Graph was tabled illustrating the key issues which had been raised during consultation. Further discussion of the housing theme was deemed necessary to broaden the policies.

3.2. Meetings with working groups/councils to refine policy objectives

3.3. Community Infrastructure Levy/ SoWN Projects meeting with local authorities and others

- David Noakes gave account of CIL meeting in April. CIL projects list was tabled. DN confirmed the role that neighbourhood plan areas would have in at the top of the hierarchy for the consideration of projects by the Community Council. This is set out in the Southwark S106 Planning Obligations and CIL Supplementary Planning Document. There is no specific prohibition on revenue CIL projects, nor on projects delivered in the Lambeth section of the neighbourhood money using CIL generated in the Southwark section (and vice versa). However some of the projects suggested by the working groups were not detailed enough, or not eligible for CIL spend.
- Ted Inman added that Lambeth had been generally positive about the weight likely to be given to the neighbourhood plan's projects list. He also explained he was drafting a proposal to boroughs on generation and defrayal of CIL and a memorandum of understanding setting out relationship between SoWN, local authorities and neighbouring forums. Includes how defrayal of CIL will work alongside Southwark's Community Councils and Lambeth's CLIPs processes. The MOU will attempt to define the differences between the strategic (75%) and neighbourhood (25%) elements

3.4. Developing protocols with neighbouring forums

- Secretary is working with Bankside Neighbourhood Forum and, when they are designated, the Kennington, Oval and Vauxhall Neighbourhood Forum, to ensure policies are compatible. Also considering joint procurement of consultants.

3.5. Developing cultural policy

- Paper was tabled and comments sought.

3.6. Writing policies

- SoWN is now being supported by two volunteers from a planning policy background who are advising on the writing of formal policy. We met for the first time on 19 June and discussion helped identify what evidence is still needed to support our policies.
- We envisage that policy writing will take another two months as every policy has to be checked for conformity with the law, cross referenced with sustainability objectives and the need for it evidenced, sometimes by commissioning new studies.

4. Financial report 14/15 and budget 15/16

Phoebe Greenwood, SoWN's Treasurer presented

- End of year accounts 1014/15
- Budget 2015/16

5. Any other business

- John Langley reminded the group that as the planning stages become more technical, he or Ben Stephenson would be glad to answer any questions or clarify points.
- JL also sought volunteers to act as neighbourhood planning champions for the SoWN Summer party on 16 July.

6. WORKSHOP: The future of South Bank & Waterloo Neighbours

Facilitated by Lorraine Hart, Community Land Use

6.1 What is missing?

- Communications – two way - to and from members and stakeholders
- Public Relations – promotion, managing reputation of the organisation
- Administration – Secretariat, finance etc.
- Collecting and generating new ideas
- Accountability – to local people and organisations
- Spending - If it is possible to use CIL for revenue spending, where does the control, management and/or monitoring of this spending fit in for the long term?
- Reviewing – to learn and improve and longer term “checking-up” post implementation of the NP.

6.2. Clarification/additions to roles outlined in the circulated suggestions

- Oversight role for SoWN in delivery of public services should be included in monitoring
- Monitoring involvement and engagement (including widening and deepening participation) in the NP process and structures to ensure diversity and inclusion of equalities groups and ways to enable this
- CIL – influencing spending or spending directly?
- Potential addition to enabling aimed at CIL revenue spending and supporting other organisations to deliver locally via partnership development (e.g. acting as accountable body for local groups). Wacoco would be willing in principle to fold if SoWN could do what Wacoco does.
- Coordination and planning of delivery between local delivery bodies
- Links and debates with other strategic bodies

6.3. Issues raised by potential SoWN roles

- Parish Council proposal would be positive mainly because of CIL but undesirable because of impact on business engagement and involvement
- Current SoWN representation of business and residents will be helpful with the proposed delivery role for SoWN.
- Potential conflicts/tensions with existing players across the NP area for ALL potential roles for SoWN that have been outlined.
- Representational role for SoWN – need to ensure good representation for all types of residents and businesses
- Some VCS organisations may be open to joint working/merger with SoWN for some of its proposed roles where there is current overlap and benefits are mutual.
- SoWN Secretarial and communications role will be particularly important in representational issues going forward.

6.4. Next Steps

There is a need to carry out an audit of local organisations (T&RA's VCOs, Businesses) of who is carrying out all of the proposed SoWN roles currently and then to start a discussion with these organisations about potential ways to address overlap/competition to explore final agreement on SoWN's future roles.