



MEETING MINUTES

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Subject: | Chambers Wharf - Section 106 and Community Enhancement Fund |
| Date and time: | Monday 28 September 2021, 6:30pm – 8:00pm |
| Location: | Virtual – via Microsoft Teams |
| Chair and note taker: | Chair – Patricia Brown Note taker – Emily Black |

| Item | Topic | Lead |
|------|--|-------|
| 1 | Welcome, introductions and format of the meeting | PB |
| 2 | The Chambers Wharf Section 106, Community Enhancement Fund and the potential way forward | DT/JC |
| 3 | Discussion and next steps | All |
| 4 | Any other business | All |

Chair

- Patricia Brown, Chair (PB)

Tideway

- Allen Summerskill, (AS)
Stakeholder and Consents
Manager
- Emily Black, (EB)
Engagement Manager

London Borough of Southwark

- Dan Taylor, Programme Manager (DT)
- Jacqueline Christie, (JC)
Senior Planning Officer

Residents and resident representatives

7 residents attended and are referred to throughout these notes by their initials:

- AA
- LB
- HC
- MC
- JEP
- NL
- ST

| | Item | Action |
|-----|---|--------|
| 1.0 | <p>Welcome, introductions and apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PB welcomed all attendees, made introductions, and explained that this Community Liaison Working Group meeting will focus on the Chambers Wharf Section 106 process and Community Enhancement Fund. There will be an opportunity for any other business at the end, if anyone has other questions for the team. • The meeting will be hosted by the London Borough of Southwark and the format of the meeting will be a presentation from Southwark Council officers and then a round table discussion. | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 2.0 | <p>Chambers Wharf Section 106 and Community Enhancement Fund</p> <p>DT presented slides on the Section 106 agreement and Community Enhancement Fund for the Chambers Wharf site.</p> <p>Around the Chambers Wharf site, over £6 million has been provided to deliver projects in the local area. This is broken down into two pots of money with £5.385 million allocated, through a Section 106 agreement, to projects agreed with the Council plus a £1 million pot specifically allocated for a Community Enhancement Fund.</p> <p>Section 106 (£5.385 million)</p> <p>This includes improvements for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure and highway projects e.g. Cycleway 4, Jamaica Road crossing • Play spaces e.g. George Row play space (the project video can be viewed on YouTube - George Row Playground Consultation - YouTube.) • Open spaces e.g. Thames Path improvements • Schools e.g. Over £3.4million has gone to local schools. <p>Community Enhancement Fund (£1million)</p> <p>The £1 million Community Enhancement Fund is administered by Southwark Council and enables residents and organisations to pitch ideas to a panel of local representatives, to request funding for community initiatives. The panel currently meets twice a year to vote on applications.</p> <p>To date over £350,000 has been allocated to projects through the Community Enhancement Fund. Please see the presentation slides for examples of the different types of projects funded so far.</p> <p>Some of the Section 106 projects and Community Enhancement Fund projects have already been delivered; others are still in development, and some were delayed due to the pandemic.</p> <p>It was explained that the Community Enhancement Fund needs to be used to benefit people within the designated red line area as outlined on Southwark Council's website. Those that can apply include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident organisations • Individuals • Local schools • Charitable organisations • Businesses <p>So far 36 applications have been submitted with 27 being approved by the panel.</p> <p>DT explained that improvements to the application process had already been made to allow voting to take place during the pandemic.</p> <p>Improvements to the scheme made so far include:</p> | |
|-----|--|--|

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased amount of panel members • Simplified application process and form uploaded to Southwark Council's website • Information required to inform the panel about any match funding • Due to the pandemic, risk assessments are required from applicants • Engagement strategy e.g. flyers being prepared / use of notice boards to promote scheme <p>Southwark officers suggested potential improvements that could be made going forward, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving charities, who could bid for projects that take place within the red line boundary • Offers of Southwark Council hosting walking tours to demonstrate best practice and to generate ideas / encourage applications • Potentially looking at an independent panel advisor / chair to aid the process <p>Information on the Community Enhancement Fund designated area, criteria, a copy of the legal agreement and the application form are available on Southwark Council's website. The webpages also include a tracker of all the projects that have been funded for both the Section 106 and Community Enhancement Fund.</p> <p>Action 1 – EB to provide links to attendees of all the documents and websites mentioned in the meeting. Action closed.</p> <p>Links are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Webpage on the Community Enhancement Fund, including the fund application form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Link here - Main page • Background webpage including legal agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Link here - Background | Action 1 – closed |
| 3.0 | <p>Discussion, comments and queries</p> <p>The below discussion points have been grouped together in themes as items were revisited during the meeting.</p> | |
| 3.1 | <p>Allocation of Section 106 funding for Play</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB noted that attendees need to understand the two sets of funding. He noted one is the c.£5million (Section 106), which the community doesn't have a say in, apart from Play aspects. The other is the £1 million Community Enhancement Fund which the community does have a say over. • LB noted that a deed of variation was requested as part of the Section 106 agreement but 'Play' was not defined. • ST agreed with LB's points regarding the deed of variation due to unsuitable projects being included in the original legal agreements e.g. play over archaeological site. • It was noted that funds were originally allocated for play area at King Edward Manor Park but this was varied to provide flexibility. | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>Allocation is £600k, (comprising 2 amounts of £400k & £200K). These amounts can either be combined to be spent in one location or several.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DT noted that £600k was allocated to play across the red line area. Southwark Council is progressing the George Row play scheme. It is expected to cost around £400k. The remaining funds can be spent in other locations on Play. • LB noted that there was an error in the cost figures regarding play in the presentation. DT checked during the meeting and confirmed there was an error. <p><u>Post meeting note</u> – the cost has been corrected in the presentation. The version published on Tideway’s website shows the correct figure for George Row and Play in general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB stated the process feels ‘top down’ rather than ‘bottom up’ and the Council are imposing projects down onto the community. PB stated that the aim of this meeting is to help ensure that schemes aren’t imposed and that the process is ‘bottom up.’ LB stated that there remains confusion and the community do not have clarity over what is being spent and where. • ST understands that improvements to the play area at the back of Cherry Garden Street are included within the £600k funding pot as the project has a project manager who has drawn up designs and ST has commented on them. • LB noted a play / landscaping document that contained good ideas that could be revisited. • LB queried whether the Dickens Estate has been consulted on the George Row proposals. JC noted that there have been two consultations on the George Row scheme and everyone within the red line zone was consulted with, including Dickens Estate. LB questioned whether there has been any recent discussion with the Dickens Estate. • Action 2 – Southwark Council officers to engage with Dickens Estate TRA over George Row plans. • Action 3 – Southwark Council officers to engage with Wrayburn Community Organisation over Bevington Street grassed area. | <p>Action 2 – open Action 3 – open</p> |
| 3.2 | <p>Thames Pathway landscaping plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JEP noted that there was a real absence of green space on the Thames Path and in the local area with the exception of Southwark Park. He noted that the River is a big draw for people, but there is nowhere to sit. • JEP asked whether the plans to re-landscape the Thames Path had already been agreed through the planning process or is there still opportunity to comment. He queried where there is possibility for more grass / greenery? • JEP asked if the area of Cherry Garden/Cherry Pier to the east of the landscaping plans had been forgotten and whether it can be included or would need a new planning application? | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area to the east of the pier is just inside the red zone boundary. ST noted that this area used to have at least one bench, but it was removed due to anti-social behaviour. • ST noted that Southwark Council has previously consulted on the Thames Path plans and had sent out 1000 leaflets. Many residents ST spoke to did not know about the plans. ST asked for the consultation period to be extended. ST did some supplementary questioning of residents and submitted the document to Southwark Council. • ST noted that the Cherry Garden TRA was not consulted with initially but subsequently there has been a site visit with ST and relevant council officers. • NL reiterated desire for more seating along the Thames Path and especially seating designed to see the river. • NL would like the alleyway used by the pier to be improved as it disrupts the continuity of the Thames Path. • JC noted that any areas not included in the current scheme would require a new application to the Community Enhancement Fund. Southwark would need to consult on any plans as it was not included in the previous Thames Path proposals which are in their final design stages. • Details to apply to the fund and the application form are available on Southwark's website above or residents could contact JC directly for assistance. | |
| 3.3 | <p>Local area walkabout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DT offered residents a walkabout around the red line boundary with the existing play / landscaping documents to encourage applications for the Community Enhancement Fund. • LB stated that a site visit with Southwark was requested in July 2021, but it shouldn't just be with him, others from the community should be invited. <p>Action 4 – Southwark Council to host resident walkabout, to encourage applications to be made from the community for the Community Enhancement Fund. Action closed.</p> <p><u>Post meeting note</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A walkabout with Southwark was hosted on 4 November 2021 for residents. The GetInvolved mailing list was invited (c.270 email addresses). • DT and JC also did a mini walkabout with LB and other residents on 7 October 2021. • Another walkabout will be scheduled for early 2022 subject to Government Covid-19 guidance. | Action 4 - closed |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 3.4 | <p>Community Enhancement Fund application process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HC wanted to understand the process to apply as an individual to the Community Enhancement Fund. • Can she apply? How does it work? How would the Council make sure people support an idea? Does the Council help with speaking to other residents on her behalf? Or does the Council help with consultation letters? • DT noted that ideas put forward to the panel should benefit the wider community rather than a private individual / residence, but an individual can apply. It was noted that often the best ideas are those that come with neighbour/wider support. • Details to apply to the Community Enhancement Fund and the application form are available on Southwark's website above or resident could contact JC directly for assistance. | |
| 3.5 | <p>Funding panel procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LB raised concerns regarding the processes and procedures associated with the Community Enhancement Fund and Section 106 play funding. LB noted he requested this meeting at previous CLWGs to tighten the procedure. • Residents noted concerns around <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ideas that come to the panel that do not meet the criteria - ideas that come to the panel that are not feasible - the voting procedure - the frequency of the panel meetings - that the panel receives inadequate feedback regarding decision making / funding / progress - that consultation responses can be made up of a small self-selecting group with similar demographics - that formal consultation is not engaging and doesn't encourage responses • DT noted that the CLWG can agree tweaks to the process, but the main rules are laid out in the legal agreement. The process has been adapted to ensure the panel could continue throughout the pandemic e.g. panel can vote via email. • JC noted that engagement has been made more difficult during the pandemic lockdowns. • PB suggested bringing in specialists who could help talk directly with young people and could look for strategic opportunities. E.g. Young Advisors • ST noted looking at strategic priorities - the 'legacy' that had previously been agreed - is good idea and currently a failing of the panel. ST was unsure of merit of paying for an external party to do so. | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------|
| | Action 5 - EB to circulate to attendees GLA document from regarding making London more child friendly. | Action 5 - closed |
| 3.6 | <p>Schemes for older people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AA noted gaps in the discussion for projects for the over 60s / older people. • DT noted that Southwark Council welcomes applications aimed at older people but hoped that the majority of schemes funded would have benefits for all users e.g. Thames Path improvements. • JC noted that there have been two engagement activities undertaken with the community. Comments received indicated that improvements aimed at young people was of interest to the community. • JC also noted that there have been some applications received aimed at older people e.g. communal gardening project at Parker's Row. • Southwark Council encourage applications and noted that this could be an opportunity for residents to work with a charity e.g. Age Concern. • ST noted that herself and other residents have expressed desire for new seating and renewed seating, and this would benefit older people who want to enjoy the riverside. • It was noted that the George Row play scheme is more geared towards children. • ST noted that there is an opportunity in the George Row scheme for extra seating for older people to use. This would enable intergenerational contact, fun, interaction and creates a happy community. • AA noted that there had been sports lessons funded for children to encourage exercise, could these be adapted to provide gentle exercise to over 60s. | |
| 3.7 | <p>Fountain Green Square</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AA confirmed that Fountain Green Square would require new application to the Community Enhancement fund. | |
| 4.0 | Any other business? | |
| 4.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HC noted an issue with noise on the Chambers Wharf site. <p>Action 6 - Resident to email AS regarding noise on site to discuss issue further.</p> | Action 6 - closed |
| 4.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NL queried the planning style notices that had been seen on street. • It was suggested that these were not Tideway related but were Article 4 direction notices. <p>Action 7 - EB to circulate to attendees Southwark Council's website information on Article 4.</p> | Action 7 - closed |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 4.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NL noted concern regarding barge manoeuvres close to houseboats / residential moorings. Generally, they take place outside Chambers Wharf, but some have taken place close to moorings. Tideway are aware of the concerns and confirm our contractors have been in contact with the relevant sub-contractors. | |
| 5.0 | <p>PB closed the meeting and thanked all for attending.</p> <p>Below are the links that were discussed at the meeting and were asked to be circulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southwark Council webpage on the Community Enhancement Fund, including link to the fund application form – Borough, Bankside and Bermondsey - Southwark Council Southwark Council background webpage including legal agreements Borough, Bankside and Bermondsey - Southwark Council Southwark Council webpage on Article 4 Directions George Row play - video GLA report – Making London Child-Friendly Voice Opportunity Power - report (an initiative that might be of interest) | |

Actions:

| Meeting Date | Item | Action | Responsibility | Status |
|--------------|------|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 27/09/2021 | 2.0 | New Action 1 To provide links to attendees of all the documents and websites mentioned in the meeting | Emily Black | Closed |
| 27/09/2021 | 3.1 | New Action 2 Southwark Council officers to engage with Dickens Estate TRA over George Row plans. | Dan Taylor / Jacqueline Christie | Open |
| 27/09/2021 | 3.1 | New Action 3 Southwark Council officers to engage with Wrayburn Community Organisation over Bevington Street grassed area. | Dan Taylor / Jacqueline Christie | Open |
| 27/09/2021 | 3.3 | New Action 4 | Dan Taylor / Jacqueline Christie | Closed – a second walkabout will be hosted in early |

| | | | | |
|------------|-----|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Southwark Council to host resident walkabout, to encourage applications to be made from the community for the Community Enhancement Fund. | | 2022 subject to Covid-19 guidance. |
| 27/09/2021 | 3.5 | New Action 5 EB to circulate to attendees GLA document regarding making London more child friendly. | Emily Black / Paticia Brown | Closed |
| 27/09/2021 | 4.1 | New Action 6 Resident to email AS regarding noise on site to discuss issue further. | Resident / Allen Summerskill | Closed |
| 27/09/2021 | 4.2 | New Action 7 To circulate to attendees Southwark Council's website information on Article 4. | Emily Black | Closed |
| 28/07/2021 | N/A | Outstanding Action Tideway to contact resident of Luna House regarding the tanks and trial for potential covers. | Allen Summerskill | Closed |
| 28/07/2021 | N/A | Outstanding Action Southwark Council staff to look into safety of crossing point on Jamaica Road and liaise with Transport for London if necessary. | Southwark officers | Closed |
| 28/07/2021 | N/A | Outstanding Action Southwark officer to meet LB for a site visit | Southwark officer – Dan Taylor | Closed |
| 28/07/2021 | N/A | Outstanding Action CLWG to be held focussing on the Section 106 and Community Enhancement Fund. | Tideway and Southwark | Closed |