



Southwark Planning

Objection to Draft Local Business Support & Relocation Strategy Update In support of Application Elephant and Castle Town Centre and LCC Campus at the EC (ref: 16/AP/4458)

Prepared by
Dr. Patria Roman-Velazquez
Loughborough University London
On behalf of Latin Elephant, CIO
&
Mr. Santiago Peluffo
Migrant and Ethnic Business Readiness Project Officer
Latin Elephant, CIO
&
Ms. Natalia Pérez
Migrant and Ethnic Business Readiness Project Officer
Latin Elephant, CIO

After consultation with traders in the Shopping Centre, **Latin Elephant** is writing to object to the 'Draft Local Business Support and Relocation Strategy Update' letter submitted 13 November 2017 by DP9 Ltd on behalf of Delancey as a condition to Planning Application **Elephant and Castle Town Centre and LCC Campus at the EC (ref: 16/AP/4458)**.

- 1) Our main objection is that months after our objection plus the several comments on the last draft, the offer by the developer was still not done in consultation with the traders and local organisations. This update only consists of one page and the content is still very vague and doesn't address most of the concerns already raised by BAME traders at Elephant and Castle (EC) shopping centre.
- 2) Above all, we request that traders and local organisations supporting traders should be involved in drafting the relocation strategy and subsequently having an input on section 106 agreement. This should include Traders Association, Latin Elephant and Tree Shepherd and Elephant Amenity Network.
- 3) We continue to ask for a separate compensation fund to be allocated for loss of trade during the relocation period. This has not been mentioned in the developer's latest offer.
- 4) There is still no clarity over timing of the relocation strategy. When does the relocation strategy and transition period begin? We are concerned that a number of businesses are already leaving the shopping centre due largely to, but not solely, uncertainty over the redevelopment.
- 5) As for the new offer, we believe both figures for the relocation fund and provision for affordable units raise the question of how has that number been reached. Are the £753,384 part of the 'payment in-lieu' by the developer for not complying with Southwark policy of at least 10% provision of affordable retail space? How is that figure established and what are



the criteria behind it? This process should be transparent and should be done in consultation with the traders. They have established the figure is not enough to cope with various costs associated with the displacement.

- 6) Latin Elephant and the traders have previously objected to discretionary use of the fund. Discretionary use of fund raises questions such as: how is that fund distributed, among how many traders/businesses, who gets what, how much and based on what criteria? This process should be transparent and should involve the traders who are being affected by the redevelopment.
- 7) Traders are concerned that most of the monies (if not all) will be destined to surveyors, solicitors and other firms that will be commissioned by the Council. Traders would like the power of choice and would like to exercise their own rights.
- 8) In a recent letter to Latin Elephant dated 17 November, Cllr Mark Williams says 'money from the relocation fund will contribute towards physical costs of relocation and fit out of new premises' – Traders are worried that the money will be destined to transform garages at Perronet House into retail units and be left with nothing to face their costs for displacement.
- 9) Regarding the Perronet Garages, there are still many questions. Cllr Williams mentioned in his letter there will be 11 units and it has been agreed that at least 27 independent businesses would need assistance relocating, so these units are not enough to fit all traders. As for the consultation for Perronet House, 16 out of 21 responses to this consultation were negative, with some mentions of leakage in the garages. It seems clear that there are many uncertainties about that place as an option.
- 10) The proposed model of 'arcade shops' in the Perronet House commissioned to a firm of architects (Carl Turner Architects) was not shown to traders in the drop-in session of October 2nd. This goes back to the point of traders feeling left out of the consultation process.
- 11) At the same time, Cllr Mark Williams (in the abovementioned letter to LE) has mentioned Arch Street as a proposed relocation site. Traders claim this alternative has not been consulted with them and has not been mentioned in the drop-in session on October 2nd nor has been included in the draft relocation strategy by the developer. Traders believe Arch Street is secluded, tucked away, therefore leading to a significant footfall loss.
- 12) These alternatives go against the already expressed wishes of BAME traders to remain clustered (throughout relocation and in returning to new development) as evidenced in the reports: '[The case for London's Latin Quarter: Retention, Growth, Sustainability](#)' and '[Relocation Alternatives for EC Traders](#)'
- 13) In the same letter, we were surprised that Cllr Williams did not make any reference to Phase One (building in the corner of New Kent Road and Elephant Rd), which according to the Council documents (drop-in session on October 2nd) and relocation strategy by the developer will have 7 'affordable' units for existing independent traders in the Shopping Centre. There is still lack of concrete information as to when will those units become



available and what the criteria of 'affordability' and qualification will be. Traders have also expressed concern that there was no mention to the 'affordable' units along Walworth Road from Lendlease development.

- 14) These last points raise the issue of why isn't there a full list of available affordable units within the locality available yet.
- 15) It worries traders that there is still no reference nor commitment to giving them priority to return to current Site once it is rebuilt.
- 16) Traders are very concerned after receiving a letter from the Council requesting information to go ahead with CPO. No clarification has been given to traders who perceive any reference to a CPO causes great distress. We wonder why this letter was sent out when there is an on-going dialogue and there are still many points to address, and no agreement has been reached on a relocation strategy.
- 17) And finally, in the referred letter Cllr Mark Williams says the Council is 'seeking to secure general business support and relocation advice for tenants of Hannibal House, market stall operators and independent retailers who have moved into the site since 2014'; and in the 'Draft Local Business Support and Relocation Strategy Update' submitted 13 November by DP9 Ltd on behalf of Delancey it says the developer will 'provide additional Tree Shepherd funding to extend their trader support services to all businesses within the East Site red line'. We welcome this initiative of Cllr Mark Williams to extend assistance to other independent traders, however it is still unclear whether assistance will be provided to all independent businesses within the red line since we were told by Tree Shepherd to date they are only assisting 24 independent business owners.