

Feedback on first draft of charter

Aim of the charter

- I am confused. Your newsletter states in the previous workshop section “This was followed by an additional set of workshops held in the summer of 2024 which was used to draw together the first draft of the charter.”
- But at the workshops in June and July we were told that the document was the first draft. This document has not changed from the one we viewed and discussed. Your statement in the newsletter is not true!
- We need independent advice to help us make informed decisions about the charter. We aren't experts at this so any feedback we give you is based on the non-expert opinions and thoughts of members of the community.
- You say it will reflect the priorities of local residents, but
 - the offers do not. The main request I have heard, is ‘like for like at no extra cost,’ ‘we don’t want to be left worse off,’ ‘we don’t want to end up in debt or in financial partnerships to the developer or with anyone else other than what we currently are committed to.’
 - The community want to see a significant amount of social and affordable housing. This is not committed to in the charter
 - The community want powered by people at the heart of the charter. It should be referred to in the charter aims and at every stage in the rest of the charter.
- You say more detailed offers will be developed in partnership with the developer. Surely that should be in partnership with the local community and the developer. You are leaving us out of the most crucial element of the regeneration.
- If this is to be a working document and include the principles of engagement please could we have some statement about the power given to residents to challenge and veto any decisions made by the developer which they are unhappy with.
- Please could you also demonstrate in the charter how you will be transparent about the views you have gathered from the residents. I asked for a copy of our feedback from the workshop (email 9th July) but none has been forthcoming.

Strategic narrative

- This strategic narrative fails to address the need for social homes as well as affordable homes. Given Labour's stated ambitions for social and affordable housing, this narrative should be clear from the start on the intention to make this a non-negotiable foundation of the regeneration.
- The charter should include clear definitions and percentages of affordable housing in line with existing BCC policies. In line with BCC policy there should be 35% affordable homes – 25% social housing and 10% low-market housing (80% market price)

- The strategic narrative should also make clear that the regenerations first priority is to regenerate for the sake of the existing community and that as a result, no existing member of the community will be pushed out or compelled to become financially worse off as a result of staying in ladywood.
- The statement “ This investment aims to regenerate the area by bringing,” should read “This investment aims to regenerate the area for the existing community by bringing”
- Please also make specific reference to faith groups and their buildings in the new community facilities section.

What we know so far

- This section would be better phrased in order to communicate clearly and truthfully “What residents have told the council so far.”
- Residents have also told you that we need independent advice. You have promised this in page 6 under empower, ‘throughout the life of the regeneration,’ and Helen Shervington stated, to me that it would be provided to enable us to contribute meaningfully, ‘at every stage of the regeneration.’ This is a stage of the regeneration/ part of the life of the regeneration. Please could you add this into the engagement and communication section.
- In the ‘Vision’ section, where it states , ‘delivering for people as well as places.’ could this be rephrased, delivering for the people of the existing and anticipated future community.

Engagement Principles

- Reset Reshape and Restart is a slogan which is synonymous with devastating financial cuts following the bankruptcy of the Council. Is this appropriate to use in the charter?
- I think your wording is misleading in reference to public participation. As part of Powered by People, please include the 5 principles of participation in this section
 1. We will be inclusive, accessible and fair
 2. We will be respectful
 3. We will act openly, honestly and with integrity
 4. We will collaborate
 5. We will shift power to communities
- The 6 types of public participation are different to principles of participation. Please keep these but make clear the difference rather than confuse the terminology from your own documents.
- You refer to the Resident Steering Group: Please provide clarity in the charter on the formation, membership, and powers of the Resident Steering Group.
- Please also firm commitment to give decision-making powers to residents through this group.
- Please make clear commitments to use technology in accessible ways. We have already had a number of technology issues which have disempowered mobile phone users and those who didnt have a work email address in recent consultation exercises. BCC must commit to do better.
- With regards to Independent Advice please make clear in the charter that residents should have a right to select the most appropriate independent advice, as well as the

provider. Procurement it would seem will take place by BCC following a consultation process which initially was inaccessible and will be undertaken as far as we know without residents' involvement.

Residents Offer

- Please include a firm commitment on how residents will be involved in specifying the elements of the offers made in the regeneration process. We request a firm commitment to make residents equal partners in the process of establishing what the offers will be.

Offer to council Tenants etc

- The terms 'wherever possible' and 'if not possible' are vague and open to interpretation. The likely losers in that situation will be the disadvantaged tenants at the will of the extremely advantaged developer. Please remove these statements and replace them with the specific conditions where it will and wont be possible.
- In the event of a single move not being possible, please provide clear time frames for how long a tenant may not be in the area. It needs to be a clear commitment otherwise the tenants may be disadvantaged indefinitely with no incentive for BCC to redress the problem and no right to compensation should the time frame be exceeded..
- Please provide commitments to a number of social homes irrespective and independent of the developers profits. This is a major requirement of the charter.

Offer to homeowners

- The terms 'wherever possible' and 'if not possible' and 'reasonable' are vague and open to interpretation. The likely losers in that situation will be the disadvantaged homeowners at the will of the extremely advantaged developer. Please remove these statements and replace them with the specific conditions where it will and wont be possible/ and what is considered reasonable and nor=t reasonable.
- Please make it clear what the conditions are for remaining in Ladywood. Be clear about what kinds of houses will be subject to demolition, what will not and what will happen to enable homeowners not to be left financially worse off or encumbered by additional debts in order to be able to stay on the estate.
- Please make it clear that homeowners properties will be replaced like for like. Freehold properties will be replaced freehold and leasehold leasej=hold with no detriment to their lease.
- Please be explicit about the nature of the financial models being offered beyond shared equity and zero rent shared ownership. These options leave homeowners worse off. I have not met anyone who wants these financial models . David Stevenson said much work was taking place to look at models other than these. Please include them in the charter. A firm commitment is needed to ensure truly affordable homes are available.

Offer to Non-Secure Tenants/Temporary Accommodation

- The terms 'wherever possible' and 'if not possible' are vague and open to interpretation. The likely losers in that situation will be the disadvantaged tenants at the will of the extremely advantaged developer. Please remove these statements and replace them with the specific conditions where it will and wont be possible.

Offer to Businesses

- The terms ‘wherever possible’ and ‘reasonable fees’ are vague and open to interpretation. The likely losers in that situation will be the disadvantaged business at the will of the extremely advantaged developer. Please remove these statements and replace them with the specific conditions where it will and won't be possible. And what is reasonable or not in terms of fees.
- Please make clear what the limits for timely return will be. This provides protection for businesses and a timeframe for their planning. It also means that they can receive recompense if BCC fails in its commitment.
- Please commit to communication models with businesses. The business owners I spoke to felt out of the loop and in the dark.

Offer to Local Services

- Religious communities have not been involved previously in the design of this proposal. This lack of prior consultation is a serious breach of the “due regard” public authorities should have towards groups and individuals with protected characteristics, Equality Act 2010, section 149, and the 2012 Public Sector Equality Duty. As the original documents produced by the council stated that secular provision would replace religious provision, it is essential that specific details are included in the charter about the offer to faith communities. Please include a commitment to work with faith communities to ensure they have a lifeline for like replacement of their facilities if they wish to remain based in Ladywood.