

ROEHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP

Notes of a meeting of the Roehampton Partnership held at
Whitelands College, University of Roehampton, Ruskin Room,
Roehampton SW15 on Tuesday, 8th July 2014

PRESENT

Rev. J. McKinney (in the Chair)	Holy Trinity Church
Mr. V. Ganeshacomar	Co-operative Food
Mr. A. Woldu	Café Joy
Mr. M. Newey	Roehampton Club
Mr. J. Horrocks	Roehampton Forum
Miss. S. Price	Roehampton Resident
Mr. D. Lunt	Roehampton Resident
Miss P. Harris (on behalf of Dr. S. Manning)	Roehampton Trust
Fr. D. Gummett	St. Joseph’s Church
Councillor J. Ambache	Wandsworth Borough Council
Councillor P. Ellis	Wandsworth Borough Council
Councillor S. McKinney	Wandsworth Borough Council
Mr. D. Cremin (on behalf of Dr. P. Ilves)	Wandsworth Clinical Commissioning Group

OBSERVERS

Mr. S. Fannon	Roehampton Resident
Miss M. Hogan	Roehampton Resident
Ms T. Jones	Roehampton Resident
Mr. J. Milton	Roehampton Resident
Ms. J. Milton	Roehampton Resident
Mr. K. Rowbottom	Roehampton Resident
Mr. F. Vennon	Roehampton Resident
Mr. M. Young	Co-op Food

IN ATTENDANCE

Mr. D. Edwards	Housing Department - WBC
Mr. N. Smales	Economic Development Office - WBC
Mr. J. Moore	Economic Development Office - WBC
Mr. J. Newton	Economic Development Officer - WBC
Ms O. Okere	Committee Secretary – WBC

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

On item 1, apologies for absence were received from Councillor P. Carpenter (Wandsworth Borough Council).

On a separate but related matter, Rev. McKinney reported that Councillor Carpenter was recently admitted into hospital but is recovering well and asked that the Partnership best wishes be passed on to him.

Councillor Ambache raised the issue of members missing Partnership meetings three times and asked that they be contacted to find out if they still wish to be members of the Partnership. He also raised the point that those deputising for absent members ought to be representative of the member organisation.

2. DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

On item 2, the Chairman having asked, there were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests and other personal relevant interests.

Rev. McKinney informed the Partnership that he is married to Councillor McKinney.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Rev. McKinney informed members that the former Chairman, Councillor Cousins, has had to step down following the reduction in the number of Cabinet Members by Wandsworth Council. As such a new Chairman would need to be elected before the commencement of the meeting.

Rev. McKinney then reminded members why Councillor Cousins was elected as Chairman. The Partnership is a sub-committee of the Council on the regeneration issue so has an advisory role on the Council and each member on the Partnership represents an important slice of life in Roehampton. The Partnership is given 'muscle' if it has a voice on the cabinet of Wandsworth Council. As such, Councillor Cousins, in his capacity as Cabinet Member for Regeneration, was duly elected as Chairman. As Councillor Ellis is now the Cabinet Member for Housing with remit for regeneration, it follows that he will be the appropriate person to be appointed as Chairman of the Partnership. So Rev. McKinney said he would be nominating Councillor Ellis as Chairman for the 2014/2015 year and this was formally seconded by Councillor Ambache. As there were no other nominations or volunteer to stand as Chairman, Councillor Ellis was unanimously voted in as Chairman of the Partnership.

Councillor Ellis thanked members of the Partnership for his nomination and stated that it would be a pleasure and honour to serve as Chairman of the Partnership. He then went on to give a brief synopsis of his various roles within the council in his 12 years as councillor.

4. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (PAPER "A")

On item 3, it was

Agreed – That the notes of the previous meeting held on 10th February 2014 be confirmed and signed as a correct record subject to it being noted that all reference to the 'preferred options' under item 10, 'Alton Masterplan' should read as 'preferred option'.

5. MATTERS ARISING

On item 4, the following matters were raised:-

Agenda item: Mr. Horrocks said that the Roehampton Festival was agreed as an agenda item at the last meeting of the Partnership but was not on the agenda for this meeting. As such, he asked that the item be put on the agenda of the next Partnership meeting.

Alton Area Masterplan: Mr. Horrocks asked why following the consultation process from 10th February to 6th April 2014 there was no meeting of the Partnership in that time to enable it Partnership arrive at a view on the matter

Mr. Moore replied that if the Partnership had requested an additional meeting during this period, one would have been arranged. A meeting was held on 10th February where the Partnership was given a presentation of the Preferred Option ahead of the consultation period. If the Partnership wished to submit a coordinated response during the consultation period this would have been accepted and considered by the Masterplan team alongside feedback from other organisations.

Rev. McKinney added that the local council and European elections were held in that period when Committees/meetings tend to halt. In any event, Roehampton Partnership acts as an advisory group so it cannot provide a unified view instead it is the views of local residents that ought to be heard. Councillor Ambache added that the whole idea of the Partnership is for it to be the 'eyes and ears' of the community. He asked that a meeting of the Partnership be called before the final draft of the Masterplan report is presented at the Council's Housing and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee in September. Councillor Sutters added that it was more important for individual residents to come forward with their view and Mr. Cremin said that the Partnership was all about the indigenous people of Roehampton and serving them.

Community Safety: Mr. Lunt (Roehampton Resident) said that following on from the last meeting and the matter raised about charges for calling the police on the 101 number, he could now confirm that callers to that number are charged 50p to cover the cost of running the service. Mr. Lunt said he had advised residents not to use it but to use the 020 8785 8140 number which is cheaper for residents.

Mr. Lunt also reported that the street drinking problem at Portswood Place had returned and was as bad as ever. The DPPO has worked hard but there is a need for the police to be the area more often. The Partnership heard that it was a different group of drinkers now as the intimidation aspect of it was no longer present, and that removing the drinkers would reduce the number of s the drug users on the street.

On a separate matter, Miss Price spoke about the piece of land behind Putney and Stag Lane and asked if the rubbish on the side of the lane will be cleared as it is overgrown. Mr. Edwards (WBC – Housing Department) said he would look into this.

6. ALTON AREA MASTERPLAN

On item 5, Mr. Moore reminded the Partnership of the agreed Preferred Option which was discussed at the last meeting of the Partnership in February 2014. The Preferred Option was developed from the options consultation and presented proposals for the revitalisation of Danebury Avenue Town Centre; Park Centre at Portswood Place; higher quality homes on Danebury Avenue; new central park; and local connections and transport. Ms Newton then spoke about the Preferred Option consultation which took place between 10th February and 7th April 2014. The process sought to determine the local community's and stakeholder views on the proposal for the Alton Area. The consultation and engagement process involved various mode of communication including public meetings and exhibition; flexible engagement, presentations and questions and answers sessions with community groups; stakeholder meetings including with the University, English Heritage and GLA concerns re: bungalows at Portswood Place, service providers and the Methodist organisation; library exhibition; newsletters; online presence; information booklets and questionnaires and direct door knocking so people living in the area were made aware of plans being put forward and could ask questions.

Ms Newton fed back on responses received on the proposals identified under the Preferred Option. 254 responses were received out of the 3,800 questionnaires distributed with the options booklets. As regards the Danebury Avenue Centre, the majority of the responses received supported the provision of more and improved retail facilities as well as the retention of the library service and community space. The least popular suggestion was the provision of student housing although this was different when the door-to-door knocking process was undertaken and the rationale behind the location of managed student housing in the Danebury centre was explained. Ms Newton said that this was an example of why different data collation methods are needed: during face-to-face discussion residents are involved in discourse that is not available with the questionnaire method. There was also support for targeted housing redevelopment, the revitalised park centre in Portswood Place; and investment in the park and public realm.

On transport and connections, 33% of all respondents supported the proposal that a controlled, limited vehicular access should be allowed at the western end of Danebury Avenue at certain times of the day although 45% were against it. The Partnership heard that a petition was received from the Alton School asking for the barrier to be retained whilst Tunworth Crescent Residents were opposed to the pedestrian and cycle link to Richmond Park due to the perceived problems of cyclists using it. Councillor Ambache raised concerns that question 21 of the questionnaire which refers to the K3 bus route contains no detailed information about the route. In response, Ms Newton said that the detailed information was contained in the booklet that came with the questionnaire.

Mr. Newey (Roehampton Club) sought an explanation as to the choice of responses on the questionnaire especially the 'support in part' response which he said was unclear. Ms Newton then explained why it was necessary to have it as part of the response received, as with a number of proposals an answer which only allowed a positive or negative response is not fit for purpose. For example, a responder may agree to a proposal in principle, such as a better bus service, but may have issues with parts of the proposal such as the proposed route for the bus

service. Therefore, a response titled 'support in part' was included along with space for further written comments.

Ms Newton went on to speak about the development area door knocking which took place over a six week programme with 70% of households successfully visited. All the households were visited at least three times at various times of the day, and telephone calls made to ensure that residents living in the redevelopment area were fully aware of the proposed Masterplan and given opportunities to discuss aspects of the plans in detail and develop their understanding. Ms Newton then fed back on information received following the visits made to households in Danebury Avenue, Harbridge Avenue and Portswood Place. For example, in Harbridge Avenue, there was support for the proposed housing redevelopment but this was often accompanied with a request for further information about design and layout of proposed properties and the resident offer. Mr. Cremin asked whether residents would be moved back to their property after the redevelopment as he is aware that older residents are concerned about this. Ms Newton said that the plan is for residents to be moved only once in the process with as little disruption as possible. She added that the Minstead Garden sheltered residents being referenced by Mr. Cremin have been spoken to and their concerns about availability of garden space, noise reduction and being re-housed in as similar a size of property as they currently occupy are all being considered.

Mr. Moore concluded by listing out the next steps which include the publication of the consultation report, to resolve the remaining Masterplan issues and prepare final designs, to publish Masterplan update newsletter, to prepare the final Masterplan report for the September Housing and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee before proceeding into turning elements of the Masterplan proposal into planning policy.

Councillor Ellis thanked Mr. Moore and Ms Newton for their comprehensive report. He added that there was an absolute commitment to ensure that residents can remain in the area that they want. Councillor Sutters welcomed the plan that affected residents would only have to make one move but asked whether appropriate properties were being built to accommodate the needs of residents already on the transfer list because they have outgrown their property. In response, Mr. Moore said that a housing need assessment will be carried out for council tenants to ensure they receive appropriate sized homes in the new development whilst leaseholders will get the same as they currently have.

Miss Price asked about the number of leaseholders subletting their properties and Ms Newton said that a provisional figure is currently being used because further investigations will be needed to ascertain a definitive number. Miss Price sought confirmation that the figure of 322 for the number of residential properties in the redevelopment areas was correct and Mr. Moore confirmed that it was.

Ms Harris (Roehampton Trust) asked how local residents could get involved with the development of Petersfield Rise. She added that despite living on the Alton East she was unaware of any information about the regeneration. Ms Newton said, in response, that the Alton East information was included in the preferred option information in the library and on the website and that individual meetings had been held with the Petersfield Rise businesses and community hall, but that further information would be available in the near future.

Mr. Horrocks sought clarification on why only 254 respondents had returned their questionnaire despite 3,800 questionnaires been sent out. In response, Mr. Moore said that people could not be made to return the questionnaires and this was part of the reason why there were various methods of engaging with the community during the consultation period. Ms Newton confirmed that the masterplanning team had spoken to 37 different community groups and that the team's contact details were widely publicised during the consultation period should residents have queries about the questionnaire. Mr. Horrocks said that he was one of the people who had not completed the questionnaire because he did not think it was good enough. He thought the questions were leading and designed to give the Council the answers it wanted.

Councillor Ellis said, in response, that there was no hidden agenda on the part of the Council and that the low response rate only confirmed that people are not good at completing questionnaires. However, this was taken into account by the various methods put in place for consulting with residents. Mr. Moore added that the questions on the questionnaire were put on only after they had been approved by the Council's policy unit to ensure they were fair. The responses received from the questionnaire formed only a part of the process which will feed in with other responses received to complete the consultation report. Mr. Moore said that there was nothing disingenuous about the process which had been as open and transparent as can be.

Rev. McKinney thanked the officers for their presentation and said that he was pleased with the proposal for the K3 route as it will make the lives of the neediest in the community much easier.

Councillor Ambache said that the poor response was probably due to people being sceptical about consultations. He asked why the Masterplan report was not yet available. In response, Mr. Smales (Economic Development Officer) said that collating all the information received was a huge exercise and responses from statutory bodies were still coming in. He assured Partnership members that the information received are being collated as fast as possible but it is just as important for it to be accurate.

Mr. Lunt said that as a resident affected by the regeneration plans, he wanted to thank the officers for their time in meeting with residents, for understanding the fears of residents, for listening and coming back with plans that will suit the needs of residents. He was especially thankful about plans for the K3 route.

Mr. Young (Roehampton Business – Co-operative) sought confirmation about the number of times businesses might be moved during the regeneration and raised concerns that this might give competitors an opportunity to move onto their patch. In response, Mr. Moore said that he was conscious that businesses are different from householders and the need for continuity of service. As such, there will be discussions with retail units to work out how best to accommodate them during the process.

Rev. Rowbottom (Roehampton Methodist Church) thanked the officers for their work on the consultation process but expressed concern about the way information has been presented. For example, he referred to the bar graphs which had been used in the presentation but which deal only with the small minority of people who returned their questionnaire. As such, he asked whether officers would

put other responses received in a pictorial form to give an overall picture as it was important that a fair picture of responses received is produced. Mr. Moore said, in response, that not all questions and responses would be presented in the form of a bar chart. The report will include a summary of the other form of responses received so it is digestible for people to read. Mr. Moore agreed that there was a need to think carefully on how to present the information fairly, accurately and precisely.

There followed discussion about provision of housing for students at the University of Roehampton. Mr. Lunt said that the University had, at a meeting held after the local elections, indicated that it would want most of its students out of private letting so that the University will have more control over them. In response to a remark that there is bound to be anti-social behaviour in areas with a large student population, Mr. Newey said that Roehampton was fortunate to have the University and with about 70% of the university population being females there was no problem with anti-social behaviour as the vast majority were well behaved. Councillor Sutters added that the University was very engaged and should be welcomed in the community. In any event, residents will be happier if students are housed within a managed area.

In response to various questions, Mr. Moore said that he would provide a breakdown of how many social housing, leaseholders and students will be affected by the regeneration plan; and he confirmed that there was a statutory requirement to remove asbestos which might exist before any demolition can take place.

Following discussion it was agreed that a meeting of the Partnership be called before the next scheduled meeting in October 2014. It was also agreed that a copy of the PowerPoint presentation be sent out with the minutes and for the Masterplan report to be sent to Partnership members before the next meeting.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEM

On item 6, the following matters were raised for future agenda items:-

- Roehampton Festival
- Potential users of new buildings
- Primary care facilities
- Employment opportunities
- Standing item – Roehampton regeneration

Miss Price spoke on a number of items which she thought could be future agenda items including transport issues to access the new community buildings, car parking facilities on the site, safeguarding issues and inviting potential users of the proposed community buildings to the Partnership meeting to find out more about their work.

Mr. Moore said that there have been detailed discussions with the various stakeholders about their requirements and needs etc. Miss Price said that it was important to know about the different organisations and what they do so should be invited to a meeting of the Partnership. Mr. Moore said he would look into issuing such an invitation to the stakeholder organisations.

Mr. Cremin said that at the last CCG meeting, there were concerns raised about the regeneration proposals from residents of Dover House. Councillor Ambache said it was important that the focus be on community needs so the health needs and training opportunities for young people and those out of work should form part of the future agenda items.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- To be confirmed.

[Post-meeting – it was agreed that the next Partnership meeting be scheduled for Tuesday, 9th September 2014]

The meeting ended at 9.00p.m.