

NINE ELMS STRATEGY BOARD

Notes of the initial meeting held on Wednesday, 26th January 2011 at 9.30 a.m., at City Hall (Room 3), The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA

PRESENT

Members of the Strategy Board: Sir Simon Milton and Mr Giles Dolphin (Greater London Authority); Councillor Sally Prentice (Deputy Chairman) and Councillor Mark Harrison (Lambeth Borough Council); Councillor Edward Lister (Chairman) (Wandsworth Borough Council); Mr Colin Lovell and Ms Michele Dix (Transport for London); Mr Sean Ellis (St James Group); Mr David Laycock (Ballymore Group); Ms Jan Lloyd and Mr Matthew Evans-Pollard (Covent Garden Market Authority); Mr Eugene Doyle (Royal Mail Group); Mr Jeremy Castle and Mr Rob Tincknell (Treasury Holdings); Mr Jim Moore and Mr Phil Edwards (National Grid plc); Mr Jonathan Rawsley (Sainsburys plc); and Mr George Kyriacou and Mr Steve Riddell (CIT – Green Properties).

Officers and observers: Mr Colin Wilson, Ms Claire O'Brien and Mr Martin Scholar (Greater London Authority); Ms Sue Foster, Mr Les Brown, Mr Zbig Blonski and Mr Clive Fraser (Lambeth Borough Council); Mr Paul Martin, Mr Mike Brook, Mr Tony McDonald, Mr Steve Mayner and Mr Francis de Lima (Board Secretary) (Wandsworth Borough Council).

1. Introductions and Apologies

The Chairman, Councillor Lister, welcomed all attendees to the meeting and, at his suggestion, all present introduced themselves.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Govindia (Wandsworth Borough Council) and Mr David Lunts (Homes and Communities Agency).

2. Minutes

The draft minutes – Paper A – circulated with the agenda was approved as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

3. Strategy Board – draft Governance Arrangements and Terms of Reference

Mr Martin explained that the tracked proposed changes set out in Paper B were the product of discussions between representatives of Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils and the Landowners' Group, as agreed at the first meeting of the Strategy Board on 19th October 2010.

Councillor Harrison proposed that the Strategy Board's agenda papers ought to be published online.

The Chairman and Sir Simon Milton both suggested that caution ought to be exercised in deciding to do this, as there would inevitably be papers in future that would contain confidential information, including commercially sensitive material. They suggested that, perhaps, it might be prudent to adopt the practice followed by local authorities of publishing all papers that are devoid of confidential material together with a public version of papers containing, for instance, commercially sensitive information. They agreed that the documents that could more readily be published are the minutes of meetings.

Councillor Prentice in supporting the proposal to publish Strategy Board papers, explained that local residents were clearly interested in learning about plans for, and developments in, their area. Besides, Lambeth had many more residents than Wandsworth within the opportunity area. She said that she supported the local authority approach to the release and publication of information.

Mr Castle enquired about the legal status of the Strategy Board and of the decisions it takes, with particular reference to current discussions with Wandsworth Council about the Section 106 payments. In response, the Chairman advised the meeting that the two Local Authorities – not the Strategy Board – would be responsible for Section 106 matters, including, for example, the settlement of a contribution of these monies towards TfL projects.

Mr Martin explained further that the Strategy Board was not a legal entity and had no executive powers vested in it. It was more a matter of the respective Local Authorities and parties committing themselves to its decisions.

Mr Lovell pointed out that TfL would be a signatory to the Section 106 agreement for Battersea Power Station site development.

After discussion, Paper B – incorporating the tracked changes – was approved.

Action:

- (a) Subject to approval of the draft Vision Statement set out in Paper C, the Secretary to update the Governance Arrangements and Terms of Reference document by incorporating the tracked changes and the revised Vision Statement, together with any other changes that may be agreed at this meeting; and
- (b) The Secretary to circulate the updated document with the agenda for the next meeting.

The Strategy Board then considered the draft Vision Statement – Paper C. Councillor Prentice advised the meeting that Lambeth Council's view of the

draft Statement was that it was more of a description rather than a vision representing local people's aspirations for the future of the area. Ms Foster explained further that, whilst Lambeth Council did support a good deal of what was in the draft, it would like to see it expressed in more visionary terms. Therefore, she proposed that discussions be held between the partners following the meeting, with a view to revising the draft Statement accordingly.

Ms Foster's suggestion was approved.

Action: Ms Foster to provide the Secretary with suggested revisions to the Vision Statement for circulation to all partners, for their comments, and to ensure that a revised draft Statement is submitted to the Strategy Board at the next meeting, for approval.

4. Opportunity Area Planning Framework – Section 106

On Paper D, Mr Castle expressed concern regarding the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy would be dealt with in the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) Funding chapter.

Sir Simon Milton explained that, as the public consultation on this replacement Chapter 12 – on Section 106 funding – of the draft Opportunity Area Planning Framework had commenced just a little more than a week ago (17th January 2011), he was unable to provide any definitive answers to questions on the subject, at this meeting. He suggested that it would be more appropriate for the matter to be raised again, to be addressed collectively, in a proper forum.

The Strategy Board then concurred with the Chairman's view that it would be appropriate to consider Paper L – Community Infrastructure Levy – Mayoral Draft Charging Schedule – at this point.

In introducing his report, Mr McDonald said that the report explained some of Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils' concerns especially in respect of how the proposed Mayoral CIL would affect funding for the Northern Line Extension in view of the Crossrail levy and on how to implement the CIL without it impacting on the funding gap. He called for further discussions between partners and said that the CIL ought to be applied across the whole of London.

Sir Simon Milton stated that he was unable to advise on how the issues raised in the report should be resolved but he confirmed that it was the Mayor's wish that both Crossrail and the Northern Line Extension should go ahead.

Ms Foster confirmed Lambeth Council supports the position outlined by Wandsworth Council. She explained that it was not a matter of challenging the proposed Mayoral CIL but rather about what project it is intended to finance. Lambeth Council would rather that it was directed to funding the Northern Line Extension rather than Crossrail.

Ms Dix commented that, perhaps, not many developments would be affected

because they had already received planning permission.

Mr Castle commented that it would have been preferable if the GLA's consultation on the OAPF Funding chapter could be deferred until the Mayoral CIL issue is resolved.

In response, the Chairman advised that parallel consultations were possible and Mr Dolphin indicated that such parallel consultations on the major projects was helpful. Sir Simon Milton explained that it was necessary to commence consultation in view of the risk of losing momentum.

The meeting noted that the closing date for the GLA's consultation was 1st March 2011. Councillor Prentice asked that Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils be provided with summaries of the comments received to the consultation.

Action: Mr Dolphin to arrange for summaries of consultation responses to be provided to Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils.

Mr Ellis stated that one of the points that the landowners/developers would make in their representations is that, given the substantially large sums involved, the presumption that the money should be paid at the commencement of a development, was unrealistic.

In response, the Chairman assured the Landowners' Group representatives that local authorities understood the point being made.

5. Support and Delivery Team

In introducing his report – Paper E – Mr Brook summarised the changes proposed to the staffing proposals in the light of the comments made by partners' representatives. He drew particular attention to the amendment to the job description of the Team Leader post that makes clear that the post would be responsible to Wandsworth Council's Economic Development Officer for operational issues but reporting to the Strategy Board. He also stated that, as yet, there were no staff involved full-time on Nine Elms – Vauxhall regeneration work.

6. Working Groups

The meeting agreed with the suggestion by the Chairman, that it was inappropriate for the 'Support and Delivery Team' to be included in this list as no working group was involved and that, accordingly, reference to it should be removed from the list.

Mr Martin informed the meeting that, following prior discussions, it was proposed that Wandsworth Council should be responsible for convening meetings of, and the work of, the Housing and Social Infrastructure Working Group and that Lambeth Council should be similarly responsible for the Public Realm Working Group.

The Strategy Board agreed these and the other proposed allocation of responsibilities for the Working Groups.

Action:

- (a) All partners to note the allocation of responsibilities to the Working Groups; and
- (b) The Secretary to maintain updated list of Working Groups and the allocation of responsibilities to partners.

The Chairman commented that the revised arrangements appeared to allocate responsibilities fairly and that it was inevitable that each Council would have legitimate concerns in relation to their respective Boroughs. However, the agreed allocation would allow for the work of the Strategy Board to be progressed in a co-ordinated way.

7. Communications Working Group (10.12.10)

In introducing the reports – Papers F and G – Mr Ellis stated that there were two significant matters he wished to raise with the Strategy Board that required early clarity to enable the work on naming and branding to proceed successfully. These were:-

- (a) the matter of funding. He indicated that, without wishing to cause embarrassment, he was asking formally (i) whether the publically-funded bodies would be prepared to contribute financially towards the costs of the work; and (ii) whether, similarly, the landowners/ developers were also prepared to make financial contributions. He emphasised that it was crucial to know what the total contributions would amount to so that the work could be commissioned accordingly; and
- (b) a commitment by the Strategy Board that they would be prepared to accept what was recommended by the appointed consultant. He explained that such commitment was required in order to avoid abortive work and, therefore, costs.

In response, the Chairman gave an assurance that Wandsworth Council would make a financial contribution.

Ms Foster explained that Lambeth Council had believed that this work would be funded by the landowners/developers, whilst her Council would fund work in relation to community engagement. Accordingly, the prospect of having to make a further financial contribution would present her Council with a significant challenge.

Councillor Harrison argued that, if the branding work were to focus primarily on the Nine Elms area, there would be little relevance to Lambeth.

The Chairman commented that the object of the exercise was to assist with the marketing of the whole of the regeneration area. He advised that partners did not need to state their intentions in respect of financial contributions at the meeting but should respond to Mr Ellis subsequently to advise him whether or not they were prepared to make a financial contribution and, if they were, what the level of their contributions would be.

Mr Ellis explained further that the exercise was not aimed at promoting the Strategy Board but rather “to brand the place” as the name that had been employed this far – “Vauxhall, Nine Elms, Battersea” (VNEB) – is considered by developers to be rather a mouthful and “all things to all people”.

Mr Martin commented that, as has been agreed by the Strategy Board, once a new brand name has been agreed, that name would be used consistently in reference to the area and with ‘Strategy Board’.

In response to Councillor Harrison’s comments about the difficulty inherent in deciding upon a new name as, for instance, Vauxhall Cross is not in Nine Elms, Mr Mayner remarked that Councillor Harrison’s aptly summed up the challenge that faced the Working Group in identifying a brand name that fully and adequately embraced the opportunity/regeneration area, which is why sufficient time was required to be devoted to the task.

The Chairman then commented that, as regards Mr Ellis’ request for a commitment by the Strategy Board to commit themselves, at this stage, to the name that is eventually recommended, he believed that it would be difficult for partners to give such a guarantee at this stage. However, he added, it was evident that the consensus view of the Strategy Board was that all parties wanted to have a brand name “that we can all live with”.

In reply to a question by Ms Dix about the amount intended to be spent on the exercise, Mr Ellis explained that, in order to minimise costs, the brief-building and consultation work would be carried out by the Working Group rather than by the consultants. He expected that the overall costs, resulting from the approach outlined in Paper G, would be £70,000.

Mr Ellis then reiterated the view of the developers within what was and would be the largest regeneration area in London, that they wanted a defined and easily recognisable geographical area. He said that the use of the post code was an option but that that would be a weak and inadequate one.

The Strategy Board then approved the recommendations in the last paragraph of Paper G.

Action:

- (a) All parties formally to advise Mr Ellis, as early as possible, whether they would be making a financial contribution towards the costs of the naming-branding exercise, and if they would be, the level of that contribution;

(b) in furtherance of the approved recommendations in Paper G, St James Homes or another landowner to act as client for the contract to take the action necessary for this work.

8. Employment Working Group (30.11.10)

The Chairman noted that there was general agreement among the partners to the approach outlined in Paper H.

With reference to the third bullet point of the 'Next Steps' in the final paragraph - "Set up a meeting with the leading industry players to identify the key issues", Ms Dix enquired about the need for this given that these issues must be known to the Working Group.

In response, Ms Lloyd explained that, as there were no representatives from the construction industry present at the meeting, the Working Group was keen to hear their views directly and learn from them, with a view to the preparation of an implementation plan.

Councillor Prentice commented that, with reference to the second bullet point of the 'Discussion', given that building works would be conducted over the whole period of the regeneration of the area, there was a need to be aspirational and focus not merely on entry jobs but on skilled construction jobs.

In response, Ms Lloyd explained that the Working Group were indeed exploring the whole area of employment prospects beginning with what jobs were available immediately in the current period, through what would be available during the development period, and then in the post-construction period. She stressed that, whilst the Working Group had now started its work, this was merely the start of a long-term and on-going process, and that the job prospects at all stages were being examined.

Councillor Prentice then said that her wish was to ensure that local people in Vauxhall had access to good jobs within their own area rather than these jobs going to people from well outside the area.

The Strategy Board noted and endorsed the Next Steps set out in the final paragraph of Paper H.

9. Utilities and Wharfs Working Group

In introducing Paper I, Mr Castle explained that, whilst the GLA had originally been allocated responsibility for this Working Group, responsibility had now been transferred to the Landowners Group and that Treasury Holdings is happy to accept this responsibility.

Mr Lovell commented that, as was made explicit in the report, it would not cover transport and, therefore, TfL was in agreement with what was proposed.

Sir Simon Milton confirmed that the GLA would be represented on this Working Group.

Mr McDonald informed the meeting that Wandsworth Council had previously expressed its concern at the suggested relocation of Cringle Dock to the east of RMC Battersea and reiterated that the Council could not support this relocation.

The Chairman suggested that this Working Group should also consider Thames Water Utilities Ltd's proposals in the area as part of the Thames Tunnel project.

Action: Treasury Holdings to arrange the first meeting of the Utilities and Wharfs Working Group.

10. Northern Line Extension Working Group – update

Ms Dix informed the Strategy Group that the Northern Line Extension Management Group held its first meeting on 17th January 2011, after having met informally last November. Other work streams will be the NLE Finance and Structure Group and another on the design of the TWAO.

Ms Dix said that the minutes of the NLE Management Group had been prepared and that she would have them circulated to members of the Strategy Group shortly. The Finance and Structure Group, which has as members people with the necessary expertise, has been asked to produce a paper on the financing of the Northern Line Extension.

Ms Dix also explained that a proposal had been submitted to the TfL Board on the possible co-promotion by TfL of the TWAO, subject to a financing plan being in place. She stressed that TfL would not undertake to do this unless they were confident that a robust financing plan was firmly in place.

Action: Ms Dix to arrange for the minutes of the NLE Management Group (17.1.11) to be circulated to members of the Strategy Board.

11. Community Engagement

In introducing Paper J, Ms Foster commented that, whilst the report on community engagement that had been considered by the Strategy Board, at their first meeting on 19th October 2010, had provided a useful introduction to the subject, Lambeth Council felt that the approach needed to be developed further and that local people ought to be involved in the development of this approach.

Accordingly, in January 2011, local community representatives were brought together and, arising from that meeting, fresh proposals for community engagement have been put forward in Paper J. Ms Foster explained that this approach involves the setting up of an area-wide Community Forum for Lambeth, which would meet four times a year. She suggested that

Wandsworth Council might similarly consider setting up a Community Forum for its Borough.

The proposals then suggested the establishment of themed Community Working Groups to support the work of the Strategy Board's themed Working Groups, which, it is also proposed, should have representatives from the Community Working Groups.

Ms Foster stated that, in order to ensure that the Borough Councils worked collectively and effectively, there ought to be an officer-level group, comprising Lambeth and Wandsworth Council officers.

On behalf of Wandsworth Council, Mr Martin stated that his Council would wish to give more thought to the proposals in Paper G. He observed that, whilst the proposals, particularly regarding the establishment of a Community Forum, might be appropriate for Lambeth, given that there were much fewer residents in the Wandsworth sector of the regeneration area, the suggested approach may not have similar relevance to Wandsworth.

Mr Martin acknowledged that whilst the setting up of the Lambeth Community Forum might contribute towards ensuring greater transparency and accountability, care would need to be exercised to ensure that no single voice became dominant.

In supporting the proposals in Paper G, Councillor Harrison explained that the proposals stemmed from the need to ensure that the Strategy Board's Working Groups related effectively to the local community. He argued that good ideas generated from the community would be beneficial to the regeneration process, as would transparency with the work of the Working Groups and the publication of papers.

Councillor Prentice explained further that, as the Lambeth sector covered five wards in the Borough along the length of Wandsworth Road, the regeneration proposals would inevitably have a significance for a large number of people who would naturally wish to ensure that provision was made for community facilities, e.g. for walking, cycling, etc.

Ms Dix commented that she was unclear about how the Lambeth proposals would translate in terms of the Northern Line Extension Working Group. She suggested that, for this Working Group, the proposals might not be practicable or easy to implement, especially at the more technical meetings.

Mr Ellis suggested that the Strategy Board ought to agree to "do it the other way round" i.e. rather than involving community representatives in the Strategy Board's Working Groups, it might be more effective if members of the latter were to be represented at meetings of the Lambeth (and Wandsworth, if established) Community Forum/Community themed Working Groups.

This approach was agreed by Councillors Prentice and Harrison and was then endorsed by the Strategy Board.

Mr Castle asked how the existing Battersea Power Station Community Forum or site-specific groups, for example, as may be set up for the Covent Garden Market Authority, should sit alongside a potential community forum for the Wandsworth sector of the Opportunity Area. Councillor Prentice suggested that these groups should continue to meet, and sit below the area-wide forum. This suggestion was agreed by the Strategy Board.

Councillor Prentice gave, as an example, the South Bank Board and a number of groups in the Waterloo area with which her Council consults. She stated that the Northern Line Extension Working Group should also be covered by the community engagement arrangements, when agreed, because local people were asking the pertinent questions such as “who pays for this?” and “what are the benefits for us?”.

The Chairman commented that there was much merit in Mr Ellis’ suggestion about members of the Strategy Board’s Working Groups attending community-based meetings. In answer to Councillor Prentice’s question about Member-level involvement in the Working Group, the Chairman reminded the meeting that it had already been decided that they would not be directly involved in the work of the Working Groups.

Mr Brook commented that the precise memberships of the Working Groups had not yet been determined.

Action: Mr Martin to report back on Wandsworth Council’s response to the proposals in Paper G and to confer with Ms Foster, as necessary.

12. Other Working Groups

No other updates were presented.

13. TIF Study

Ms Dix observed that the report – Paper K – calls for a study. She argued that what was needed was clarity by July at the earliest and September at the latest, as the proposed consultants need to start work. December would be too late. She said that some of the work proposed to be undertaken by the Study could be pre-empted by the Northern Line Extension Working Group. She explained further that the NLE Working Group wanted to use in-house expertise as this would save money.

Mr Brook explained that Paper K was seeking approval in principle and agreed that the NLE financing work could be taken forward, with due urgency, under the aegis of the NLE Management Group.

In reply to a question by Mr Ellis about why Wandsworth Council had prepared the report, Mr Brook said that, in view of the huge gap in cash flow, it was crucial to receive good financing expertise and that all partners came together to find solutions. He also commented that funding was predicated on

increased Business Rate income and that responsibility for collecting this lies with Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils. They would need to establish what the financial risks would be of committing future Business Rate income.

The Chairman commented that that crunch would come when, at some stage, some agency would need to borrow £0.5 billion.

Ms Dix said the matter was being considered by the Nine Elms Structures and Finance Group (an NLE Working Group) and confirmed that if extreme resources were required, this matter would be brought back to the Strategy Board.

In response to Mr Ellis' enquiry about the availability of Working Group minutes, Mr Martin reminded the meeting that, as agreed at the first meeting, the Secretary – as the 'junction box' for all aspects of the Strategy Board's work – ought to be kept informed of the work of the various Working Groups and provided with copies of papers, including minutes. In submitting a paper to Secretary, it would be incumbent upon authors to make clear whether the paper may be published or should be withheld – and if the latter, whether a publication version was to be prepared.

Mr Ellis then enquired about which consultants are on the shortlist and whether financial contributions would be sought from partners. Ms Dix advised again that given that the NLE Structure and Finance Working Group was looking at this, it was anticipated that financial contributions should be minimal. She confirmed, however, that, if contributions were required, she would make a request quickly and that, if needs be, would not delay this until the next meeting of the Strategy Board.

At the end of discussion, the Chairman summed up the agreement of the Strategy Board (a) to endorse the approach outlined by Ms Dix; and (b) to accept that, as the financial decisions may not allow for delay until the next meeting of the Strategy Board, decisions could be taken, in consultation with partners.

Action: Ms Dix to report back to the Strategy Board on the financing options and on the need for any financial contributions from partners, in relation to Northern Line Extension financing.

14. Community Infrastructure Levy – Mayoral Draft Charging Schedule

It was noted that this report – Paper L – had been considered earlier under item 4.

15. Development sites

On Paper M, in reply to a question by Mr Ellis about the status of CLS, Mr Brown advised the Strategy Board that this development was still in its early stages.

On Paper N, Mr McDonald commented that productive work had been carried out with the Health and Safety Executive on the Battersea Power Station site development which, he hoped, would not be subjected to a 'call in' request. He then pointed out that the Tideway Estate planning application would be considered by the Planning Applications Committee in February 2011. The Chairman observed that this would be the third major development application to be considered in the Wandsworth sector.

16. Any other business

(a) Draft Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea Opportunity Area Planning Framework – Consultation list and brief summary

In introducing Paper O, Mr Dolphin explained that the consultation had ended a year ago and that the London Plan Examination in Public and the Wandsworth and Lambeth Councils' plan making processes had also been undertaken. Publication was intended for April or May 2011.

(b) Opportunities for the HCA to provide funding in relation to the development of Nine Elms – Vauxhall

The Chairman advised the meeting that communications with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) had indicated that, particularly as the Agency was to become part of the GLA, it would be beneficial for the HCA to become a member of the Strategy Board.

Accordingly, it was agreed that the Homes and Communities Agency should invited to become a member of the Strategy Board.

Ms Foster stated that Lambeth supported the recommendations in the report. She commented that the Agency's participation would help with the debate on the regeneration of the Nine Elms – Vauxhall area.

Mr Ellis suggested that it would be particularly beneficial if the HCA were to be involved with the work of the Housing and Social Infrastructure Working Group.

It was decided that representatives of Lambeth and Wandsworth Councils and the GLA ought to meet with those of the HCA to discuss with them the extent of their involvement with the work of the Strategy Board.

Action:

- (a) The Secretary to write to the HCA to invite the Agency to become a member of the Strategy Board; and
- (b) Mr Martin to arrange for representatives of the two Local Authorities and the GLA to meet with the HCA to discuss the latter's involvement with the work of the Strategy Board.

17. Date of the next meeting

Councillor Prentice informed the meeting that the two alternative dates – 27th and 28th April 2011 – suggested by the Board Secretary for the next meeting were not convenient for the Lambeth representatives. Given the proximity of the dates to the Royal Wedding Bank Holiday and the Spring Bank Holiday, the two dates fell in the week which appeared opportune for taking time off.

Noting the advice of the Secretary that no other date in April was acceptable to members of the Strategy Board, Councillor Prentice suggested that the next meeting be held in late March 2011. She also suggested that the Secretary be asked to seek to identify dates for the remainder of the meetings for the year.

The Chairman commented that, despite strenuous efforts and consultations, the Secretary was finding it very difficult to identify dates acceptable to all members of the Strategy Board.

The Secretary advised the meeting that his previous attempts to identify a date in late March had not succeeded.

It was then agreed that the Secretary be asked to consult again on identifying a date in late March 2011 for the next meeting and to consult members with a view to identifying dates for the remainder of the meetings in 2011.

Action: The Secretary to consult again on a suitable date in “late March” for the next meeting and on dates for Strategy Board meetings in the remainder of 2011.

The meeting ended at 10.44 a.m.

Francis de Lima
Board Secretary

Strategy Board/FDL/3.2.11