

## ROEHAMPTON PARTNERSHIP

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Roehampton Partnership held on Monday,

8<sup>th</sup> February 2021 at 7.00 p.m.

### **Present:**

Councillor Jeremy Ambache (Chair)	Wandsworth Borough Council (Roehampton and Putney Heath)
Deacon Kathy Johnson (Deputy Chair)	Roehampton and Putney Methodist Church
Ms Natasha Beckwood	Roehampton Business (Focal Point Opticians)
Ms Farrah Black	University of Roehampton Students' Union
Mr Dermot Cremin	Roehampton Patient Group (Dermot did not speak at the meeting due to IT issues)
Mr Steven Fannon	Western Area Housing Panel
Councillor Claire Gilbert	Wandsworth Borough Council (Roehampton and Putney Heath)
Ms Pamela Harris	Roehampton Trust
Councillor Sue McKinney	Wandsworth Borough Council (Roehampton and Putney Heath)
Mr Marc Newey	Roehampton Business (Roehampton Club)
Fr Alberto Pelucchi	St Joseph's Church
Mr Xico Perez	Roehampton Forum
Mr Tom Rowson	University of Roehampton (Chief Operating Officer)
Mr Matthew Tiller	Western Area Housing Panel

### **In attendance:**

Michael Hill, Founder and Chairman of Rackets Cubed  
Mariya Vlaykova, Minutes Taker

Marc Newey (MN) welcomed everybody to the virtual meeting and chaired the first part – election of Chair.

Deacon Kathy Johnson proposed Councillor Jeremy Ambache and Natasha Beckwood (NB) seconded the nomination. There being no other nominations, Councillor Ambache (JA) was elected as the Chair of the Roehampton Partnership.

The meeting proceeded to consider the business set out on the agenda, chaired by Councillor Ambache.

Pam Harris proposed Deacon Kathy Johnson as a Deputy Chair. Marc Newey (MN) seconded the nomination. Deacon KJ accepted the nomination.

### **1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Sean Heanen, Dr Kieron Earney and PC Lydia Heyward.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were declared.

### **3. Minutes of 24<sup>th</sup> November**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> November were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

#### Matters arising

MN asked NB if she has had the meeting with the Council's Town Centre Manager? NB responded that not yet and she will report back to the Partnership when this happens.

### **4. Current issues, actions and building relations**

JA reported that following the Partnership discussion before Christmas, Councillor Caddy has decided to change her recommendation and the Council would withdraw from the Partnership instead of closing it.

MN expressed his concern that Council Officers should not be in a position to withdraw from the Roehampton community. His view was that it was important for the Council Officers to keep the dialogue with the Partnership Members and stay engaged with the Roehampton community.

JA talked about the importance of the Roehampton Covid 19 Response network connecting hundreds of individuals and organisations.

Mr Steve Fannon (SF) talked about the local buildings that have been empty for more than two years waiting for demolishing including the basketball ground which was closed for over three years. He reminded the other Partnership Members that the comments for the Draft Local Plan should be submitted by 1<sup>st</sup> March.

Councillor Claire Gilbert (CG) confirmed that Jonathan Palma (JP) does a regular update including arising points from the Roehampton Covid 19 Response meeting. She also added that JP wanted to talk to Partnership Members before Christmas and will probably join any of the future meetings.

Mr Tom Rowson (TR) reported that despite the current lockdown, the campus was open, and they were supporting the 750 students on site.

Councillor Sue McKinney (SMCK) informed the Partnership Members that the new vicar of Holy Trinity Church, was Reverend Joshua Rey.

### **5. Roehampton Community Week**

Michael Hill's (MH) Roehampton Community Week Paper had been previously circulated.

MH talked about the six current projects which the Community Week were proposing and working on with the Council, local communities and supported by the local business as University of Roehampton, Roehampton Club, and many others. He reiterated that they were working to involve any community group, residents from different backgrounds, different religions, or ethnicities and that every group was included, and everyone's commitment and involvement were strongly wanted. MH said that they encourage people to participate in the projects around the year and not only during Community Week (5<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> July 2021).

The Roehampton Partnership Members expressed their support for the presented activities and projects. PH was confident that the older community would be happy to participate. CG added that all local

schools were also involved. TR confirmed that the University of Roehampton was supporting the projects and the information about the Community Week will be circulated to the students on campus.

The Roehampton Partnership Members commented on the Community Week objectives and fed back suggestions and ideas. MH agreed to participate in a virtual meeting with the local GP Practices and Patient Groups. MH was thanked for this initiative.

## **6. Transport proposal**

TR presented his proposal for the University of Roehampton and the Roehampton Partnership to co-host a roundtable event on transport and economic, social and cultural regeneration in Roehampton. Despite many discussions on the subject, there have been no actions. TR was proposing a three-part round table discussion framed around challenge topic of sustainable regeneration and improving transport in the Roehampton district, followed up in a coordinated way and engaging TFL and local MP and Councillors.

During the discussion on the proposal, the following issues were raised:

6.1 Impact on other bus routes passing by Roehampton area, for example, 85 and many more people travelling than before.

6.2 Difficulties travelling East-West around the edges of London, no direct routes and too many bus stops.

6.3 Local University Bus and school buses, not green, impact on local transport.

6.4 Need of a specific set up and involvement of TFL.

6.5 The need to all to work together in a follow-up campaign for better transport.

The Roehampton Partnership Members expressed their broad support to the proposal and recommended SF and KJ represent the Partnership and take part in the roundtable discussion in the second half of March 2021. TR was thanked for leading this initiative.

**TR**

## **7. Communication and involvement**

NB and MN talked about the required steps to improve the communications between the local residents and business representatives, and the Local Authority. The key ideas were to have a simple website, with contact form and useful information as Council Department's numbers, local events and a platform to reach more residents and communicate the work of the Roehampton Forum. It is important to have a consistent identity and to include a recognisable brand and logo. PH raised the suggestion of having access to information from local Roehampton Organisations posted on the website.

MN proposed that Roehampton Club will host and sponsor the website for the first two years, will provide the logo, but he needed help with the content so that the information on the website was up to date.

Roehampton Partnership Members were very supportive of the ideas to improve the communications and the involvement outlined by NB and MN and suggested different ways to sponsor the website including the Council, local businesses advertising and others.

The Chair asked NB, MN and PH to take the proposals forward and work to help re-establishment effective communication (and trust) in the work of the Roehampton Partnership.

**NB/  
MN/  
PH**

## **8. Views and comments on the latest Regeneration Plans**

### **a) Discussion and comments on Antonia De Lima's Email**

Partnership Members discussed the Antonia De Lima's Email about Community Engagement and the following observations were made:

- . The Regeneration team should be much clearer when talking to residents and stakeholders on what they are being consulted on, the process, and decision making, feeding-back to residents about what others have said and on next steps including timeframes.
- . Timing and Information is important – people should be told in advance that consultation is about to open and given adequate time to respond. Notices should be used more widely.
- . The consultation documents were “too wordy” and content too many pictures which put the residents off reading them. Plain English summaries translated into different key languages incorporating links were suggested.
- . So many consultations which have not delivered, people will wonder “if it is worth investing in” further consultation.
- . Actions and outcomes need to be clear, including the ways they will be achieved with explicit timeframes – the Partnership Members spoke of accountability, transparency and building back trust. Feedback following engagement activities needs to be communicated widely and to all those involved.
- . Many of the Partnership consider that the recent history of the development of the Engagement Strategy has been done without communicating clearly as to how these are to be taken forward and completed.
- . The Partnership agreed that collective consultation is best, giving the example of meetings for types of stakeholders, e.g. for businesses. There was a concern that individual consultation does not enable residents to discuss issues together and hear each other's views, and often leads to low responses.

The Partnership requested the Chair to write to Antonia De Lima conveying the Partnership's views and suggestions.

**JA**

### **b) Discussion and comments on the Housing and Regeneration OSC 11<sup>th</sup> February**

Partnership Members discussed the subject and raised the following questions and observations on the Council Committee Paper 21-45 on the Alton Regeneration.

- . There are fears that the Block where the Coop was will be demolished before there are plans agreed to rebuild the new Block A
- . The empty buildings, the Mind charity shop have been empty for two years.
- . The meaning of Joint Venture and more information about the community space and how will fit in the Community Strategy?
- . When the Planning approval was expected remains unclear.

Responding to questions from Partnership Members CG and JA made the following comments:

Block A was the name of the most welcome part of the proposals – the bulk of the social infrastructure. There are three phases: Phase One A- included the replacement of the new Library, Medical Centre and Community core; Phase One B – the new Nursery-Children Centre; and Phase Two the private housing.

To de-risk the scheme, make it more attractive to developers, the Council was undertaking so called “decant” or moving people or business from the former Coop building so they can be demolished and therefore they were empty to avoid stopping the regeneration.

Wandsworth Council has a previous Joint Venture experience with the Clapham Development. The Council is likely to copy the Clapham Junction experience and set a Board of six members, three senior officers and three development partners which will participate 50:50 on decision making and financial involvement.

Members of the Partnership will send comments on Paper 21-45 to JA and CG.

The proposals were currently with the Mayor’s office for pre-application advice before the official submission and the communication between the officials was effective.

JA and CG will take comments from the Partnership Members and will convey them to the Housing and Regeneration Committee meeting on Thursday evening.

**CG/JA**

## **9. AOB**

There was none.

The Chair thanked everybody for their contribution.

**The meeting concluded at 9.10pm**

## **10. Date of the next meeting – 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021 at 7pm.**