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The public are welcome to attend our Committee meetings, however, occasionally, committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request.
You are welcome to record any part of any Council meeting that is open to the public.

The Council cannot guarantee that anyone present at a meeting will not be filmed or recorded by anyone who may then use your image or sound recording.

If you are intending to audio record or film this meeting, you must:

- tell the clerk to the meeting before the meeting starts;
- only focus cameras/recordings on councillors, Council officers, and those members of the public who are participating in the conduct of the meeting and avoid other areas of the room, particularly where non-participating members of the public may be sitting; and
- ensure that you never leave your recording equipment unattended in the meeting room.

If recording causes a disturbance or undermines the proper conduct of the meeting, then the Chair of the meeting may decide to stop the recording. In such circumstances, the decision of the Chair shall be final.
Declarations of Interests

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

1 Personal interests

There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council’s Member Code of Conduct :-

(1) Disclosable pecuniary interests
(2) Other registerable interests
(3) Non-registerable interests

2 Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined by regulation as:-

(a) Employment, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person* for profit or gain

(b) Sponsorship –payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).

(c) Undischarged contracts between a relevant person* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.

(d) Beneficial interests in land in the borough.
(e) **Licence to occupy land** in the borough for one month or more.

(f) **Corporate tenancies** – any tenancy, where to the member’s knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person* is a partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.

(g) **Beneficial interest in securities** of a body where:-

(a) that body to the member’s knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough; and

(b) either

(i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or

(ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.

*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

(3) **Other registerable interests**

The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:-

(a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council

(b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party

(c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25

(4) **Non registerable interests**

Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members’ Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member’s child attends).
(5) Declaration and Impact of interest on members’ participation

(a) Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take not part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members’ Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**

(b) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph (c) below applies.

(c) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member’s judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.

(d) If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their, family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.

(e) Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member’s personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

(6) Sensitive information

There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

(7) Exempt categories
There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-

(a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception)

(b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor;

(c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt

(d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members

(e) Ceremonial honours for members

(f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception)
Purpose of Report

To report back on any matters raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel following their consideration of the decisions made by the Mayor on February 10 2016 or on other matters raised by Select Committees or other Constitutional bodies.
Agenda Item 3

Title of Report: The Future of Beckenham Place Park

Originator of Report: Nigel Tyrell

At the time of submission for the Agenda, I confirm that the report has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Comments from Exec Director for Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Comments from the Head of Law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Implications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Implications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Implications/Impact Assessment (as appropriate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed Adherence to Budget &amp; Policy Framework</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment Comments (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Urgency (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: _______________ Executive Member

Date: ______9th February 2016_____

Signed: ____________________________ Director/Head of Service

Date: __9th February 2016__________

Control Record by Committee Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed on Schedule of Business/Forward Plan (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report Cleared at Agenda Planning Meeting (not delegated decisions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Report from CO Received by Committee Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Date for Call-in (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Referred to Full Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Purpose

1.1 This report seeks approval from Mayor and Cabinet for officers to continue to work up designs and plans for Beckenham Place Park’s regeneration, in order to submit a phase 2 bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund. Restoration of the park is planned in accordance with the phase 1 bid approved by the Heritage Lottery Fund’s Parks for People programme. If the phase 2 bid is approved and regeneration proceeds as proposed, this will result in the closure of the existing golf course as soon as practically possible, and by 31st December 2016.

2. Summary

2.1 On 10th July 2013, Mayor and Cabinet approved the submission of bids to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) for financial support for a Beckenham Place Park regeneration project.

2.2 The HLF Parks for People bid was successful in phase 1 and funding of £4.9m was set aside for the project in summer 2014.

2.3 Since then, consultants have been appointed and background surveys and studies of the site have been carried out to inform the future design of the park and homestead buildings. These have been financed using some of the funds that the Parks for People programme allocates for this design development phase of work. In this case, the design development funds amount to £323k.

2.4 The next step will be to carry out further extensive public consultation and to progress the design work to arrive at detailed plans for the scheme. These detailed plans, worked up in response to site investigations, studies and consultation are then submitted in a phase 2 bid, for approval by the HLF. Once approved, the remaining funding is made available to implement the plans for the park.

2.5 Since the funding award in summer 2014 Council officers have met significant support and excitement about the proposed regeneration scheme, as well as some vocal and passionate opposition.
2.6 Before more extensive public consultation is carried out and design work is progressed further, Council officers are seeking approval from Mayor and Cabinet to progress the project as proposed.

2.7 The Heritage Lottery Fund grants officers have told Council officers that the funding has been made available on the basis of the masterplan submitted in the phase 1 bid, which did not include golf, and that the re-insertion of an 18 or 9 hole golf course into the scheme would mark such a change in the proposal that funding would have to be withdrawn. The Council could then bid again for funds, but it is unlikely that Parks for People would see the revised scheme as being sufficiently transformative to win funds within a very competitive bidding process.

2.8 As such, the restoration of the park in accordance with the earlier plans submitted to the HLF, and to achieve the outcomes required by the Parks for People Fund, necessitates the closure of the existing golf course. It is proposed that this takes place as soon as practically possible, and by 31st December 2016.

3. Recommendations

The Mayor is recommended to:

3.1 Approve the continuation of work on the restoration of Beckenham Place Park, and note that this will include:
   a) Public consultation about park design and facilities
   b) Ongoing design work and accompanying technical work by consultants, to be funded by the HLF grant.
   c) Submission of a phase 2 bid to the HLF for approval of the detailed plans

3.2 Approve the closure of the existing golf course by 31st December 2016.

4. Policy Context

4.1 Lewisham’s long standing vision is: ‘Together, we will make Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn’. This vision was developed following extensive consultation with Lewisham residents, public sector agencies, local business, voluntary and community sector organisations, and has been adopted by all our partners. It continues to be a bold ambition that stretches and motivates the Council and its partners to set priorities and deliver services in ways that achieve our vision.

4.2 The restoration of Beckenham place park could create a significant open space, venue and leisure facility that genuinely impacts the quality of life of thousands of residents. A park of this scale and history could make a substantial contribution to the regeneration of the south of borough, helping to engender a sense of place and pride in the area. This opportunity to transform Beckenham
Place Park offers a key moment to make a further a step towards making Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn.

4.3 The key strategic document for Lewisham and our partners is the Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2020, “Shaping our Future”. In this document, the strategic partners set out six priorities – creating communities that are:

- Ambitious and achieving
- Safer
- Empowered and responsible
- Clean, green and liveable
- Healthy, active and enjoyable
- Dynamic and prosperous

4.4 A large and thriving open space can make a contribution to local communities in each and every priority area above. Yet Beckenham Place Park is not having this positive impact on the locality currently. The Heritage Lottery Funds, made available to the Council for the regeneration of the park, offer the opportunity to harness the potential of the park for the benefit of the local community. However, officers believe that if an 18 hole golf course continues to operate in the park, the potential of the open space to make a positive contribution to each of the six priorities above is significantly curtailed.

5. Background

5.1 The park

5.1.1 Beckenham Place Park is Lewisham’s largest park by far. At 98 hectares it is 30% bigger than Greenwich Park. It boasts ancient woodland, meadow, parkland, a river and several historic buildings, as well as a golf course. It was originally acquired by the London County Council to be the key amenity space for the new estates of Bellingham and Downham.

5.1.2 Yet the park remains little known among the wider community and is used significantly less than many other Lewisham parks, despite its size. A usage and movement survey of the park was carried out by Building Design Partnership (BDP) in August 2013. This survey was conducted using low resolution image cameras at the 9 entrances of the park during two days in August – one weekday and one day at the weekend. Making an allowance for seasonal variation in use the survey allowed us to arrive at an initial estimate of park usage of around 200,000 visitors per year.

5.1.3 The usage report carried out by BDP concluded that Beckenham Place Park currently faces the following barriers to use:

- Lack of attractions and features
- Presence of unusable and derelict features
- A large area (the golf course) feels out of bounds to many visitors
Woodlands are difficult to navigate and, due to the lack of use and therefore informal ‘policing’ of the area, feel unsafe to some users.

A copy of the full report is attached as Appendix 8.

5.1.4 In order to build up a more up to date record of use across the seasons a further usage survey was carried out in November 2015.. Surveyors walked a specific route covering the park in an hour, and noted the people they saw. Hourly time slots from dawn till dark were allocated to surveyors on weekdays and weekend days to ensure full survey coverage on both a weekday and at the weekend. An average number of people present in the park per hour is then calculated, and, based on this observation, an estimate of the total number of park visitors a year can be calculated. This survey estimates that there are currently around 225,000 visits to the park per year, which is broadly in line with the survey carried out in August 2013 and may suggest there is less seasonal variation than expected. This level of use must be put in context against other large London parks – Richmond Park attracts 5.5m visitors a year, Cassiobury Park near Watford, 2.1 million visitors, Brockwell Park in Herne Hill, 880,000 visitors and Horniman Gardens 460,000.

5.1.5 As well as 98 hectares of land, Beckenham Place Park also boasts several historic buildings. Both the mansion and the stable blocks (also known as the homesteads) are listed buildings, and stand at the heart of the golf course. Following an arson attack in 2011, the homesteads are in very poor condition and require major investment.

5.1.6 The Heritage Lottery Funds offer the Council a significant opportunity to address each of the identified barriers to use, to provide new features within the park, and new facilities to attract visitors. The proposal includes the restoration of many of the key heritage buildings, as well as the stable block courtyard, and the creation of a significant water body in the park which will draw visitors and act as a key focus for the landscape.

5.1.7 The vision is to create a park offering:

- Outdoor adventure - high ropes, kayaking, mountain biking, adventure play
- An attractive historic setting - restored homesteads, courtyard, carriage drive to the mansion, historic lake and parklands and restored ‘pleasure grounds’ and garden
- Extensive educational opportunities - ecological education for children and adults, horticulture and curriculum studies in geography, history and science, a chance for all to experience nature first hand
- A unique events programme - from small scale community events to commercial film, music and arts ventures
- Sport and fitness opportunities - cycling tracks, running routes, new skate park, walking trails, Park Run, triathlons
- An attractive haven to engage with nature, relax and play - picnics, children’s play, space to explore
5.1.8 Landscape designs for the park are being developed. The current masterplan, shown in Appendix 1, indicates the emerging design at the present time, showing the proposed location of the major new features proposed and gives an indication of other elements to be included.

5.2 Buildings within the park

5.2.1 There are several buildings within the park, many of which require significant investment or demolition and removal. The 4 principal listed buildings (mansion, stable and two gatehouses) are complimented by three other buildings (Foxgrove Club, homesteads cottages and gardener’s cottage). As part of the Parks for People project funding has been secured for restoration of the stable block, gardener’s cottage and the two gatehouses. The stable block particularly is in need of very significant investment, following the arson attack in 2011. It is an attractive Grade II listed building, and through the HLF grant will be restored to its former glory and become the main visitor centre for the park including a café, toilets and an education centre. The Parks for People grant also includes funding to improve the listed gate houses and make the gardener’s cottage a HQ for volunteering in the park.

5.2.2 It is expected that it will be possible to secure the funds necessary for the restoration of the homesteads cottages and Foxgrove Club from potential users and that these can be returned to productive use in the future.

5.2.3 To date it has not been possible to secure funds to restore the mansion itself. Although it is currently in a reasonable state of repair, it requires significant investment to bring it into use, and to enhance and protect its heritage features. The presence of golf in the curtilage of the mansion has made it more challenging to attract funding for restoration to date. The Heritage Lottery Fund has indicated a willingness to consider a further bid to support its restoration once the landscape designs demonstrate how the mansion’s immediate surroundings will be transformed to become more historically appropriate for the eighteenth century mansion, and show how the park will become a popular open space. Council officers have been taking part in the HLF’s mansions working group, which aims to share best practice from completed projects and to support the development of new restoration proposals.

5.2.4 A report published in December 2013, by Drury McPherson Partnership, ‘Mansions at risk in public parks in London: A review for the Heritage Lottery Fund’ stated Lewisham’s key challenge in securing investment in the mansion currently:
“The use of part of the basement of Beckenham Park Place for golf-related purposes, with the 18-hole golf course pressing up to it on two sides and a car park in front of it, makes the rest of the house all but unusable.”

In removing golf from the park and relocating the car park, the Heritage Lottery Funded proposals for Beckenham Place Park address these barriers to restoration and re-use of the mansion.
5.2.5 Beckenham Place Park and its buildings need major investment if this historic open space is to offer the facilities, opportunities and landscape of a large and popular urban park.

5.2.6 Council officers have sought affordable means of investing in the park and its buildings for almost two decades. Many options have been explored within this time, including commercial operations for the mansion and the golf, and reworking the site to create a 9 hole golf course. All previous plans encountered major obstacles in terms of securing sustainable funding and maximising the potential benefits of the space for local people. The 2010-11 tender for the parkland and golf course, for example, including investment in the homestead buildings (prior to the fire) saw only one submission, and this was unaffordable to the Council. Further details are provided in the timeline, Appendix 7.

5.3 Attracting investment

5.3.1 It is in this context, following a twenty year struggle to secure substantial appropriate external investment in the park, that officers are now seeking approval to continue to work up the existing designs and plans for the park, and to close the golf course. Significant funds have now been allocated, from the Heritage Lottery’s Parks for People Fund. This represents a key opportunity to transform Beckenham Place Park from a little used open space, to a substantial public asset – offering a taste of the countryside in an urban environment, and giving local people a sense of history, of heritage and access to nature. Officers believe that Beckenham Place Park has the potential to become one of the best parks in London.

5.3.2 Local people have been involved throughout the long journey to secure investment for the park. Public consultation was carried out in 2008 (Continental research) and again in early 2014, prior to the submission of the bid to Heritage Lottery. The purpose of the 2014 consultation was specifically to explore to what extent the local people wanted to retain golf in the park. Four options were presented, which respondents ranked in order of preference: 18 hole golf, 9 hole golf, partial restoration which included a family par 3 golf course, and historic landscape restoration which featured no golf.

5.3.3 The survey methodology chosen in 2014 was face to face consultation, primarily through drop in sessions where the public had the opportunity to review the options and to ask questions in a relaxed and informal atmosphere. In addition a workshop session was arranged with pupils from Conisborough College to gather the views of younger people, which had been overlooked in previous consultations.

5.3.4 Those invited to the sessions included:

- Current park users including golfers and friends group
- Community Groups
- Sports Groups
- Heritage and Conservation Organisations
Local residents (through assemblies contact lists for local wards and Phoenix Community Housing’s contact lists)
Local children and young people including the Young Mayor and Young Advisers
Local assemblies (a drop in session at Whitefoot Assembly and a presentation/drop in session at Downham Assembly)
Key parties e.g. English Heritage, Heritage Lottery Fund, Environment Agency etc.

A full list of organisations invited to participate in the consultation can be found in Appendix 2.

5.3.5 Through the consultation officers spoke to around 300 people. 175 of these completed the questionnaire which set out the four options. The results clearly showed that respondents favoured a significant reallocation of park land away from golf. 77% of respondents favoured the cessation of 18 hole golf in the park. 9 hole golf was the least popular option, with only 5% support. 18 hole golf was favoured by 23% respondents. A significant proportion of people (37%) preferred the partial restoration option which included a par 3 family golf course, but very few of these people were keen to make use of this possible facility themselves and instead saw it as a suitable compromise offer to existing golfers. However existing golfers made it clear that they did not support the par 3 family golf course. 35% of respondents stated that their preference was for historic landscape restoration i.e. no golf within the park. (These results are given in Appendix 3).

5.3.6 Although the majority of respondents did not opt for ‘no golf’, it was clear from the consultation that respondents did favour a park which was much more substantially public park, and less substantially golf course. Currently the golf course accounts for 34 of the park’s 98 hectares. Those responding to the consultation clearly expressed a desire to reduce this footprint. Respondents were also asked to rank the importance of twelve other factors so that more detailed analysis of priorities could be established to inform design development. (This is discussed further at 5.4 below).

5.3.7 The phase 1 bid and masterplan (attached at Appendix 1) was submitted to the HLF in February 2014, on the basis of this consultation. The masterplan illustrated full restoration of the parkland, including reinstatement of the historic lake, restoration of the homestead buildings and courtyard, and the creation of several new facilities – cycle tracks, children’s play, a renewed skate park, pleasure gardens, café and toilets. The funding award left room for the possibility that a small family golf facility could be included within the open space, provided its footprint was reduced and brought away from the historic core of the park. However, the HLF would not fund the relocation of golf holes, and the Council would need to demonstrate how golf added to the park’s offer, and was self sustaining in revenue terms.

5.3.8 The HLF were also keen that the Council examined the heritage of the golf course, and made an assessment of its heritage value, and its overall impact on the park. This has been addressed through the Conservation Management
Plan (CMP) – a key document to guide and inform designs and plans for the park. Work on the history and heritage of the homesteads is still being carried out, such that the CMP is not yet ready for publication. Nevertheless, the assessment of the golf is complete. The report concludes that the golf course has eroded the historic character of the park, detracting from the eighteenth century parkland landscape. It highlights in particular the removal of some of the parkland tree planting and the introduction of 20th Century linear tree planting which disrupts the openness of the parkland, and distorts key views to and from the mansion.

5.4 Golf in Beckenham Place Park

5.4.1 Detailed analysis of the consultation results showed that whilst the partial landscape restoration option (with Par 3 golf included) was the most popular of the 4 options consulted on, the provision of a Par 3 golf facility was ranked only 11th most important out of the 12 factors consulted on. Overall respondents ranked the importance of features and facilities in the park as follows:

1st – Opportunities for relaxation and enjoyment
2nd – Enhancement to the heritage setting of the buildings
3rd – Access for all (making more of the park accessible for those with mobility problems)
4th – Enhancements for wildlife and biodiversity
5th – Restoration of the designed landscape
6th – Creation of more shared use routes through the park
7th – Provision of lake activities
8th – Provision of events
9th – Greater diversity of sport provision
10th – Introduction of grazing animals
11th – Par 3 Family golf
12th – 18 or 9 hole golf provision

5.4.2 Despite the relatively low support for the ‘family golf’ offer, as the funding award had left room for the possibility that a small family golf facility could be included within the open space as stated at paragraph 5.3.7 above, officers have had discussions with a commercial golf operator who operates a number of leisure golf enterprises to assess the potential of a smaller course to represent a viable business venture. It is officers’ understanding from those conversations that to develop a viable business model a number of linked attractions would be needed to generate the necessary visitor numbers. Core elements of the leisure golf business model include the provision of a large driving range, with nets and floodlighting, café/bar/restaurant, gym and extensive parking as a minimum. Without such facilities it is likely that the enterprise is not economically viable. In addition, in order to justify such a large investment any operator would require a long leasehold interest in a substantial part of the park. It is the view of officers that the presence of such a large private facility would detrimentally affect the sense of ‘countryside’ and openness so many value in the park, and would not be in keeping with the historic setting. It is also very similar in nature to the David Lloyd proposal which stirred up considerable local opposition 20
years ago and is likely to jeopardise the funding currently offered by the Heritage Lottery Fund, as the provision of these commercial golf facilities would not sit easily with the restoration of the historic landscape, nor contribute to the delivery of outcomes they require. (Appendix 4 shows the outcomes required from Heritage Lottery grant of this type.)

5.4.3 The proposed closure of the golf course comes at a time when the numbers of people playing golf nationally is in marked decline. Recent research by Sport England and Sports Marketing Surveys (2014) forecast a difficult outlook for golf courses around the country, as numbers participating in the sport frequently continue to decline, making the economics of running a successful course profitably increasingly difficult. Many golf clubs now allow members of the public to play their courses, offering non-members rates, in an attempt to bring in more income. The financial exclusivity of the sport has thus been eroded in recent years, as golfers are not required to pay large sums for club membership in order to access the course.

5.4.4 It is also notable that many other local authorities have been struggling to sustain their public golf courses in the past 12 months. Leeds, Leicester, Inverclyde, Ealing, Edinburgh, the Wirral and West Cheshire have all been trying to avoid the significant subsidy their courses require, the table below summarises the current position of some of these. Clearly none of these authorities view golf as an easy means of revenue, and, at a time of stretched resources, have decided to prioritise revenue funding elsewhere:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>Closure of one course in 2015 to achieve savings of £123,000 per annum. The course required a high level of public subsidy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Proposed closure of 2 courses which made a collective £217,000 loss in 2013/14, courses have seen a 60 per cent reduction in pay-to-play rounds from 2006/7 to 2012/13. One course closed from November 2015 the other appears to remain open as at 1st February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Withdrawal of £0.89 million annual grant, which supports 6 courses. The future of the affected clubs remains unclear but is likely to lead to multiple venue closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirral and West Cheshire</td>
<td>Together the authorities are proposing the sale of 7 municipal courses (Wirral’s expected subsidy for the golf courses they provided in 2014/15 was £440,000. The 3 West Cheshire courses included in the deal receive an annual subsidy of £246,000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.5 Locally, there are many golf courses serving the populations of South East London, open to visitors at reasonable rates, offering golfers several alternatives to Beckenham Place Park. Appendix 5 lists 18 courses that are within 30 minutes driving distance from Beckenham Place Park. Most of these welcome visitors throughout the week and many have green fees at similar rates to that offered at Beckenham Place Park.

5.4.6 Indeed, the increasing openness of other courses locally is likely to have contributed to the decline in use of Beckenham Place Park golf course over recent years. In 2002-3, 38,500 rounds of golf were played in the park. Over the next decade this declined steadily to a low of 16,483 in 2012/13, and this now appears to have stabilising at around 20,000 rounds per year. This is a
reduction of almost 50% in usage since 2002, and an even more marked decline from the course’s heyday, in the 1990s, when 50,000 rounds a year was typical.

**Golf course finances and interim contract arrangements**

5.4.7 Income to the course is clearly directly dependent on the number of rounds played, and yet the costs of maintaining a golf course remain relatively fixed irrespective of the number of rounds played. In 2002/3 the Council made an income of £350,000 from golf, but over a 10 year period to 2012/13 the annual income declined in line with the number of rounds played to only £149,000 in that financial year. (The average income to the Council per round played remained consistently below the publicised tee price, at £9-10 throughout the period, due to the special offers and concessionary rates operated).

5.4.8 In 2012, the Council therefore considered alternative arrangements that could be put in place whilst a plan for the park was developed, in order to further mitigate the Council’s exposure to the financial risk of fluctuating income. The solution agreed was for Glendale golf to be responsible for golf management at Beckenham Place Park. This arrangement was approved by Mayor and Cabinet on 30th May 2012 as an interim measure. This report set out the background to the decision as follows:

4.1 The Council undertook to Invite To Tender for the management and maintenance of the parkland and golf course to include investment to restore the listed Homesteads, cottages and outbuildings. The Council invited five shortlisted companies to tender on 14th December 2010 with tender returns due on 10th March 2011. One completed tender package was returned from Glendale. Officers met to review the financial elements of the tender return and whilst Glendale’s tender return would deliver the £3million plus worth of investment to restore and refurbish the listed Homesteads buildings the annual contract sum was significantly higher than the budget available leaving the bid unaffordable.

4.2 As officers were unable to secure an affordable bid for the management and maintenance of the parkland and golf course it was recommended (11th May 2011) to transfer the management and maintenance of the parks facilities (which included the golf course) into the Council’s existing Green Space Contract 2010 – 2020 by way of a formal contract variation. Unfortunately despite extensive negotiation this proposal was also deemed unaffordable.

5.4.9 Even when applying the same competitive Schedule of Rates which won them the parks maintenance contract for the borough, Glendale’s projected costs to maintain the park and golf course far exceeded the Council’s annual maintenance budget for the park. An alternative solution was required.

5.4.10 The report continues:

4.3 Given the ongoing process officers have continued to negotiate with Glendale in an attempt to secure a short-term option. This would entail
Glendale managing the golf and catering facilities, for them to keep all income and to pay to the Council a fixed annual sum. (see paragraph 5.4.15 below). The Council will retain the responsibility for the maintenance of the golf course and parkland until the negotiations surrounding the future management of the Mansion have been concluded or alternative options have been implemented.

5.4.11 The new interim arrangement allowed the Council to achieve greater financial certainty over income and to plan to contain the costs of the park operation within the overall budget. In the two years prior to the current contractual arrangement the park contract had overspent in 2011/12 by £31,052 and in 2012/13 by £129,841. In the two years since the park achieved a modest underspend of £14,580 in 2013/14 and a minor overspend of £7,360 in 2014/15.

5.4.12 The Glendale Golf contract was granted for three years and required Glendale golf to:
- Provide management of the golf operation
- Provide daily café and bar operation with the permitted hours, (2 Council members of staff associated with the café were subject to TUPE to Glendale Golf under the contract thereby reducing the Council’s operational costs)
- To provide marketing and publicity
- To provide a clear breakdown of course usage
- To ensure that the premises and curtilage is kept litter free
- To act as buildings and premises officers
- To liaise with the client and attend meetings with the Council and partners as requested
- To ensure that the toilets are kept clean and well stocked

5.4.13 Under the contract Glendale Golf agreed to pay the Council a fixed annual fee of £50,000 in year 1, rising to £62,000 in year 2 and £64,000 in year 3. Each year, an additional £6000 fee was paid by Glendale to the Council for utilities.

5.4.14 When the golf management and income transferred from the Council to Glendale Golf, the income from golf (in the financial year 2012-13) was £149,000. If Glendale Golf realised a similar income, following payment of the fixed fee to the Council, Glendale Golf would be left with less than £100,000 income with which to fund the service provision (including transferred staff) and modest investment in the café.

5.4.15 Under the current contract the Council is not entitled to access to Glendale Golf’s accounts for the operation of the service. However, they have privately shared details of the income earned in 2015. It is clear from this that they have improved income since the transfer of management arrangements three years ago, but the level of income remains significantly below the level necessary to support the full costs of golf provision.

5.4.16 It is clear from the information Glendale provided that the historic trend of people seeking out lower priced green fee deals is continuing. Whilst the number of rounds has increased somewhat, the income per round is not as high
as might be hoped. Several membership schemes are offered which allow unlimited golf play either 5 or 7 days a week, and enable members to play at all Glendale golf courses. Membership for unlimited play costs only £48 per month for weekday play, and £71 a month for a 7 day a week pass. A Junior pass is also offered as a complimentary gift with each 7 day pass, and members paying annually benefit from a further month’s discount (12 months for the price of 11). It is clear that many people playing regularly at Beckenham Place Park are making the most of these deals.

5.4.17 If the previous contract had remained in force, in which the Council paid Glendale a fixed sum management fee sum for the golf service of £123,864 per annum, whilst also bearing the cost of the café staff and associated building costs, (estimated to be in the region of £120k to the Council), then it is very likely that the cost of the golf management and café operation would have continued to exceed the income received in green fees. This is in addition to the net cost to the Council involved in golf course maintenance highlighted in Table 1 below.

5.4.18 The following table summarises the changes in the income and costs through the interim management arrangement put in place in 2013.

**Table 1 – summary of changes in golf contract**
The detailed figures behind this table are included in Appendix 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the current contract, 2011-12</th>
<th>Current interim contract 2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuating income from golf fees £178k</td>
<td>Fixed income from Glendale £70k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe income £36k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of course £264k</td>
<td>Maintenance of course £219k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee to Glendale for managing golf shop, ticket sales, marketing £121k</td>
<td>(see table 2 below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café staff and building maintenance costs £83k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost to the Council: £253k</td>
<td>Net cost to the Council: £149k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Glendale**                         |                                 |
| Income:                              |                                 |
| Fee from Council for managing golf £121k | Income from golf fees – fluctuating Estimated to be in the region of £200k+ on the basis of the income earned by the Council for the same number of rounds. |
| Costs:                               |                                 |
| Undeclared, but to run golf shop, manage ticket sales and marketing | £70k fee to the Council |
| Management and staff costs plus café and building maintenance costs including investment in the cafe |                                 |

The operation of golf at Beckenham Place Park today is much less financially viable today than it was in the 1990s. Last year the Council contributed around £149,000 to the maintenance of the golf course, above and beyond the income
paid to the Council by the golf operator. At times of significant budget pressures, including on park budgets, it is felt that proper consideration should be given to the services which the Council chooses to subsidise and this ongoing arrangement should be given proper consideration. Table 2 below summarises the Council’s costs in 2014-15 for providing the golf facility at the park.

Table 2 – Projected management and maintenance costs for BPP Golf Course 2015-16
These costs differ slightly from the summary presented at Sustainable Development Select Committee as it was found that irrigation costs had been excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs attributed to golf</td>
<td>157,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens and tees mowers</td>
<td>11,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid fuel pertaining to golf</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business rates</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation for the course</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds maintenance items for the course</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg topsoil, turf, dressings, herbicide etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, furniture and materials</td>
<td>13,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of golf course</td>
<td>218,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from golf operator, (including £6k utility fee)</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost to council of golf operation</td>
<td>-£148,910.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.19 It should be noted that closure of the course will not yield a £150k revenue saving. With the exception of staff costs in the table above the remaining annual costs associated with golf provision total £61,031. These ongoing costs will not be necessary if the course closes and represent an immediate saving that is similar in value to the annual income the Council receives from Glendale Golf.

5.4.20 It should also be noted that a regenerated park will need maintaining, and is likely to include some features which require skilled management, such as the lake, and additional play facilities. It will be crucial to the success of the park that these are maintained to a good standard. It is therefore expected that the considerable staff time currently invested in maintaining the golf course will, following the park’s transformation, be invested in maintaining the wider landscape and woodlands. This will allow other areas of the park to enjoy a higher standard of maintenance than has been possible with the intensive mowing regime required by the golf course. It may also be possible to achieve savings on the maintenance of the east side of the park (currently maintained by Glendale under the main LBL parks contract) if sufficient capacity is freed up through closure of the course.

5.4.21 The interim management arrangement was originally put in place for three years but it was decided at Mayor and Cabinet, on 21st October 2015, that the arrangement should be extended for up to a further year, whilst a decision was taken on the continuation of regeneration plans with the support of HLF funding.
The extension means that golf will continue to operate in the park for a number of months during 2016 under this arrangement. The practical advantages of this arrangement are:

1) New arrangements will be required if café and toilet facilities are to be offered in the park, prior to the completion of any regeneration scheme and the Council needs time to put these arrangements in place.

2) The Glendale Golf service operates from the lower ground floor of the mansion house currently, using the upper ground floor for toilets. The activity and staff help to secure the otherwise vacant mansion, protecting it from vandalism. The Council needs to ensure that suitable arrangements can be put in place to offer security to the building in the absence of this management model.

3) Whilst the golf course is not as well used as it once was golfers still use and enjoy the course. They amount to a significant proportion of current park use in non peak periods, and stay in the park for hours. As such they provide parts of the park with a level of informal policing and sense of the space being occupied, which is useful prior to the regeneration works taking place. Golfers could continue to enjoy the course in the initial interim period.

4) If the contract is to be terminated prior to 31 December 2016, the Council is required to give due notice to Glendale Golf.

5) There are staffing and possible TUPE implications associated with closing the golf and cafe operation at Beckenham Place Park and further time is needed to work these out.

5.4.22 The exact timing of the cessation of golf in the park will be worked out within these constraints, but, if the recommendations in this report are approved will take place as soon as practically possible and by 31 December 2016.

Potential income from golf

5.4.23 It has been suggested by those opposed to closure of the golf course that retendering the golf contract could result in the Council receiving a net income from golf. Officers do not disagree that the national decline of golf may yet be reversed, but the problems associated with the golf industry highlighted in paragraph 5.4.3 mean that a massive reversal of fortune broadly equivalent to rolling back 10 years of declining use would be necessary for Beckenham Place Park to achieve a position where income covers the current costs associated with course maintenance and golf/café management.

5.4.24 Given the significant staff costs associated with maintenance and management of the course, one way a private operator may attempt to enhance profitability would be through achieving savings on staff costs. This could be achieved through reductions in the numbers of staff providing the service, economies of scale or through use of less favourable terms and conditions of employment.

5.4.25 It is officers’ view that there are other potential revenue income streams within the park that are less dependent on the fortunes of a particular sport or good weather, and these are likely to generate more substantial income than the Council may earn from golf – particularly the letting of the parks’ buildings - and
that these income streams can best be developed if the park’s offer is broadened to appeal to diverse audiences.

5.4.26 A good example of an historic building within a park which is being used to generate income is Pembroke Lodge, managed by The Hearsum Family Ltd in Richmond Park. The building is used as a commercial café, wedding and conference venue. Pembroke Lodge published a figure of £250,000 per annum profit in 2013, which is contributed to the maintenance of the Royal Parks through a profit sharing agreement.

5.4.27 In Lewisham, Horniman Museum Enterprises, which is comprised of the retail, catering and venue hire at the Horniman Museum and Gardens, reported a gross turnover £465k, and generated a net profit of circa £204k. In their annual report it is stated that venue hire activity is the largest commercial income stream in terms of net profit and that there is still significant potential to expand.

5.4.28 At Tatton Park, Cheshire, £3.2million of income is generated through commercial activity. One third of this comes from events including functions focusing on arts, heritage, horticulture, family activities and seasonal events. Tatton Park is considerably larger than Beckenham Place Park, with the total estate approximately 1,000 acres, however, officers propose that an events programme could be one way to generate income to support the parks maintenance costs.

5.4.29 Examples of other income generating activities in parks in the UK include renting space for farmers markets, charging for parking, selling plants and produce grown at the park and permitting filming in the park. The latter idea already takes place in Lewisham through an arrangement with Film Fixer.

5.4.30 Further work is planned to develop proposals to generate income in the park. If Mayor and Cabinet approve the continuation of work on the regeneration of Beckenham Place Park officers will be seeking to ensure that appropriate revenue streams can be generated in the park for the long term, to support its maintenance. This analysis will be brought together in the 10 year management and maintenance plan that will be prepared to support the stage 2 HLF proposals in August 2016. The document will outline future costs based on the final design developed and income based on the latest projections from revenue generating sources.

5.5 **Opposition to closure of the golf course**

5.5.1 It must be recognised that the possible closure of the golf course has attracted significant opposition. In late November 2015, the Council received a 5700 signature petition campaigning against the closure of the golf course.

5.5.2 The petition has been running since the announcement of the Heritage Lottery funding award in summer 2014, and has been held at the golf club throughout the period, and at other locations at times. Signatures have therefore been collected over a period of 18 months and in various locations.
5.5.3 The petition states
“We, the undersigned, wish to register our opposition to any attempt by The Council to change the golf course at Beckenham Place Park from 18 holes to 9 holes. We believe the retention of the full 18 holes is essential to the maintenance of the character, challenge and community role of the course.”

As the Council’s plans became clearer, this was then altered (by page 52 of the petition) to read

“We, the undersigned, wish to register our opposition to any attempt by The Council to close the 18 hole golf course at Beckenham Place Park. We believe the retention of the full 18 holes is essential to the maintenance of the character, challenge and community role of the course – and the uniqueness and diversity of activity and use of this wonderful park.”

5.5.4 The petition represents a substantial body of people who would like to continue to play golf in the park, or seek, for other reasons to protect the status quo. The Council’s Petition Scheme requires that a petition of 4000 signatures or more is brought before the relevant Select Committee for scrutiny, and that petitions of over 8000 signatures trigger a full Council debate.

5.5.5 As a result, the Sustainable Development Select Committee discussed the petition and the proposed regeneration of the park on 14th January 2016. The Committee resolved to advise Mayor and Cabinet of the following:

*That the Committee felt that additional information should be provided on the current contract with Glendale regarding the maintenance and management of the golf course, prior to a decision by Mayor and Cabinet. This was to ensure that an analysis of the true profit potential could be made.*

This information can be found in section 5.4 of this report.

5.5.6 The Select Committee recommended that:
*The questions tabled by Councillor Curran be referred to Mayor and Cabinet and officers be requested to ensure that their report to Mayor and Cabinet addresses these questions.*

Written responses to these questions can be found in Appendix 6 of this report.

*The Mayor ensures he has sufficient information on the matters listed above (at 1.3) before making his decision on Beckenham Place Park.*

Please see section 5.4 of this report.

5.5.7 Due to the investment of officer time it would require, it has not been possible to analyse the residence of all the people signing the petition to retain the golf course. However, analysis of a 10% sample of the petition indicates that the vast majority of people signing the petition, opposed to the closure of the golf course, live outside the bounds of Lewisham borough. It is also interesting to note that only 5% of those signing the petition are from the neighbouring
Lewisham wards of Bellingham, Whitefoot and Downham which the park was acquired to benefit.

The following table displays the results of the analysed sample.

**Table 3 – Residence of those signing the petition (from 10% sample)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham residents</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Lewisham residents</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Whitefoot, Bellingham and Downham</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of other wards</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.8 The map below marks the postcode of each person within the sample signing the petition. Dark markers denote those living within Lewisham while light markers show those living out of the borough. A small proportion of signatories reside outside the bounds of the map below.

5.5.9 In addition to the petition, it should also be noted that the Mayor has received 917 letters of petition from visitors to the park, objecting to the “proposed regeneration of Beckenham Place Park and the consequential closure of the existing 18 hole public golf course”. However, these standard letters assume that the golf course generates “ongoing sustainable income” which implies that the income generated exceeds the cost of provision. The letters also say that the restoration of the lake will “destroy mature woodland and wildlife habitat”. Neither of these assumptions on which the letters are based are factually
correct, and thus some of those signing may not have done so had they understood the real financial costs to the Council of providing golf, and the ecological opportunities created through the creation of the lake and other enhancements planned in the park as part of the regeneration scheme.

5.5.10 Like the petition, the majority of the letters of objection (67%) have come from residents outside of the borough, as the table below shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>No. of letters of petition</th>
<th>% of letters of petition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>917</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Planned Consultation

5.6.1 It is also interesting to note that Lewisham residents objecting to the regeneration of the park are predominantly from other areas of the borough, and not from the neighbouring wards of Bellingham, Downham and Whitefoot. Anecdotal evidence suggests that residents from these neighbouring Lewisham wards are not using the park much currently. This is particularly concerning, given that Beckenham Place Park was acquired by the London County Council specifically to be amenity space for the new estates of Downham and Bellingham, recognising that there was, and still is, no other substantial green space in the area. If regeneration plans progress, consultation will be carried out to ensure that the restored park offers activities and facilities that appeal to people within these communities, and help them to gain the health and quality of life benefits that green spaces offer. We have been working closely with Phoenix Community Housing to ensure that we maximise engagement with people in this area. If the regeneration of the park goes ahead consultation will take place as follows:

<p>| 5 themed focus groups for invited attendees | 4\textsuperscript{th}, 10\textsuperscript{th}, 11\textsuperscript{th} Feb 2016 |
| Children and young people’s online survey advertised through schools | Jan - Feb 2016 |
| ‘High street’ consultation events in Bellingham, Downham, Catford and Beckenham | 29\textsuperscript{th} Feb, 5\textsuperscript{th}, 9\textsuperscript{th}, 14\textsuperscript{th} March 2016 |
| Displays and drop in consultation at the BPP mansion | 13\textsuperscript{th} March (provisional) |
| 3-4 open invitation evening meetings in | March |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Easter event in the park, including consultation | 26<sup>th</sup> March 2016  
| Design verification through public displays and events, to be defined | May- June 2016  
| Submit final proposal to Heritage Lottery Fund for approval | By August 2016  

5.6.2 The project is then expected to progress as follows:

- Secure funds from HLF  
  - By Jan 2017  
- Procurement and finalise detailed designs  
  - Jan- Summer 2017  
- Works on site begin  
  - Autumn 2017  
- Works on site completed  
  - By Christmas 2018

5.6.3 The Heritage Lottery grant offers a real opportunity to harness the potential of this park – not only as a beautiful and extensive open space, but also as a regeneration asset for south of the borough.

5.7 HLF Investment

5.7.1 The grant awarded by the HLF amounts to £4.9m investment in the park. £323,000 of this has been awarded already for the design and development stage of the project. These monies are being spent by the Council on staff time, architects, technical experts and consultation with local people.

5.7.2 The design phase will be completed by August 2016, when the phase two proposal is submitted to the HLF. The fund will confirm the award of the further £4.6m by Christmas 2016.

5.7.3 Grant monies can be spent on any aspect of the designs agreed in the phase two proposal for the park and homestead buildings.

5.7.4 It is expected that the capital works will be completed by December 2018. The HLF do not impose strict deadlines by which the grant monies must be spent, but require a ‘realistic timescale’ for delivery.

5.7.5 A modest amount of match funding is required from the Council, as a contribution to the project. This amounts to a total of £1million, which will be made up of insurance monies from the homesteads fire, section 106 contributions and a contribution from the capital programme.

6. Proposal
6.1 The proposal to continue the work on the masterplan for Beckenham Place Park recognises that in order to achieve the key outcome required by the Heritage Lottery Fund - to significantly increase usage of the park, and the diversity of users, it is necessary to reduce the dominance of golf in the park.

6.2 The outline masterplan proposes restoration of the landscape together with the introduction of new facilities and activities in the historic core of the park which will allow the park to become more relevant to those that live nearby. It also opens up possibilities for the restoration and re-use of the listed buildings that would otherwise be less viable.

6.3 Initial investigations have cast doubt on the viability of introducing family golf to the park, but a decision to pursue this no further at this stage does not preclude an offer being developed at some future point.

6.4 To continue developing the outline masterplan and release the Heritage Lottery capital funding to invest in the park, it is necessary to close the current 18 hole golf course.

6.5 The alternative is to halt work on the regeneration of Beckenham Place Park through the HLF award, and forego the further £4.6m investment the HLF have set aside for the open space.

6.6 Alternative funds for investment would need to be found in order to bring the historic buildings back into use, and to fund improvements to the facilities in the park. There are currently very few other opportunities to secure significant funds for the park and buildings. It may be many years before alternative funding on this scale is found. It should be noted that even if the Council were to secure a more financially advantageous golf contract, in which a golf operator covered all the costs of maintenance and paid the Council a similar sum to Glendale golf (an unlikely scenario), it would take 70 years to secure the level of investment currently being offered by the HLF.

6.7 Even if it was decided that work should not continue on the Heritage Lottery funded regeneration of the park, the Council would still need to make a decision about the continued operation of the current 18 hole golf course in the park, considering the social value offered through the provision of golf, and the costs and revenues to the Council.

7. Legal implications

7.1 In accordance with Section 164 of the Public Health Act 1875, the Council has power to provide, maintain and improve public parks. If the recommendations in this report are agreed, then this will result in the closure of the existing 18 hole golf course. The provision of golf within the park is a service that the Council provides in pursuance of a statutory power rather than a duty. It is therefore not bound to continue to do this but any decision about it must be taken in accordance with the decision making requirements of administrative law. The
decisions in this report must therefore be made reasonably, taking into account all relevant considerations and disregarding irrelevancies.

7.2 There is no statutory obligation for the Council to consult on these proposals but the non statutory consultation that the Council has undertaken to date is set out in section 5.3 of this report. The Council will also be undertaking further planned consultation as set out in section 5.6 of this report. The Mayor should have regard in particular to the representations that have been received in respect of the proposed closure as set out in section 5.5 of this report and the responses of officers to these as set out in section 5.4 and Appendix 6 of this report.

7.3 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) brings together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act includes a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The new duty covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

7.4 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

• eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
• advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
• foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

7.5 As was the case for the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

7.6 The Equality and Human Rights Commission issued guides in January 2011 providing an overview of the new equality duty, including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. The guides cover what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guides were based on the then draft specific duties so are no longer fully up-to-date, although regard may still be had to them until the revised guides are produced. The guides do not have legal standing unlike the statutory Code of Practice on the public sector equality duty, However, that Code is not due to be published until April 2012. The guides can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-duties/new-public-sector-equality-duty-guidance/

8. Financial Implications

8.1 Capital
8.1.1 If Mayor and Cabinet approve the continuation of work on the restoration of Beckenham Place Park, the project team will submit a phase 2 bid to the HLF in Summer 2016. The HLF will consider the bid, and are expected to confirm the total funding award of £4.9m by Christmas 2016. Of this amount, £323k has already been awarded and is being spent by the Council on staff time, architects, technical experts and consultation with local people. The remaining grant funding of £4.6m will then be made available to the Council for the regeneration of the park.

8.1.2 Some match funding is required from the Council, as a contribution to the project. This amounts to a total of £1 million. This will need to be identified from a combination of insurance monies from the homesteads fire, section 106 contributions and additional capital programme budget.

8.2 Revenue

8.2.1 The closure of the golf facility at Beckenham Place Park could save the Council maintenance costs associated with the intensive management of the golf course. The extent to which savings are realised is dependent on the final designs for the park, and the maintenance required for each new feature and facility. A detailed 10 year management and maintenance plan will be prepared for submission to the HLF in summer 2016. Initially any savings made in revenue expenditure may be required to cover potential once off redundancy costs arising.

8.2.2 It should be noted that in future there would be a cost attached to maintaining the area of the park formerly occupied by the golf course. That cost will depend on the nature of the facilities offered in the redeveloped park. It is expected that costs of maintaining the redeveloped park can be contained within existing budgets, and may have the potential to offer a saving when compared to the current costs of maintaining the golf course.

8.2.3 In addition, it should also be recognised that a well restored park of this scale will offer the Council opportunities to make revenue in the longer term, which could in turn be used to fund the maintenance of the park in the future. Such revenue streams are likely to come primarily from letting the park’s buildings, (the cottages within the courtyard, the homesteads, and the Foxgrove Club) and could also be obtained through events, and the commercial operation of outdoor activities such as kayaking or high ropes. In addition, it is likely that if the park is restored and the golf removed from the curtilage of the mansion, opportunities to create revenue through letting space in the mansion house could be found.

9. Equalities Implications

9.1 A key objective of the regeneration of Beckenham Place Park is to ensure it appeals to, and is more accessible to the diverse communities of South East London. If the Mayor and Cabinet approve continued progress on the restoration of the park, officers will ensure consultation is carried out with a
broad range of audiences, to ensure the park becomes a facility which is enjoyed by a more diverse and representative population in the future.

9.2 A significant component of the current phase of work is the development of an audience engagement plan which seeks to identify any parts of the community who are not using the space, identify the reasons why and to plan activities that will re-engage them. This targeted work will sit alongside the general principles of good design for the landscape and buildings, which will aim to make the facilities in the park accessible to all.

10. Environmental Implications

10.1 In regenerating the park officers seek to improve the ecological value of the open space, introducing new habitats, such as a lake, and enhancing existing habitats through enhanced woodland and meadow management.

10.2 The golf course, being intensively managed grassland, requires the use of fertiliser, fungicide and herbicide, and is of very little ecological value. The regeneration of the park would see this virtual monoculture replaced by meadow, open water and parkland which could support a much more diverse range of species, and offer people much greater opportunity to interact with nature.

10.3 The design team are working closely with ecologists, both at the Council, and from the landscape architect’s firm, to ensure the ecological opportunities of the park’s regeneration are maximised.

11. Crime and Disorder Implications

11.1 The ‘Designing out crime’ work carried out in Ladywell Fields through the Quercus Project (2006-2008) demonstrated clearly that the most important factor in preventing crime and disorder in parks is the extent to which the space is used. Crime and fear of crime reduce in open spaces when people are seen and can be seen.

11.2 Increasing the use of Beckenham Place Park is key to reducing anti-social behaviour and fear of crime in this open space. Investing in the park and removing damaged and derelict features will also deter anti-social behaviour, helping people to feel safer and discouraging casual vandalism.

11.3 In addition, there are plans to engage residents and school pupils extensively in the park, through volunteering opportunities and environmental education. As volunteers invest in the open space, the sense of ownership and pride in the park will grow. This in turn moves them to actively look after the space, and deters anti-social behaviour.

11.4 The regeneration of the Beckenham Place Park should therefore reduce crime and fear of crime in the park.
12. Human Rights Implications

12.1 There are no specific human rights implications arising out of this report

13. Conclusion

13.1 In order to set out the context for the recommendations contained in this report there is a large amount of background information. Much of it highlights the financial struggles the park has faced over the past decade or so, and the difficulties involved in establishing agreement on the best way to transform its fortunes. It has taken 20 years of work to find an appropriate solution for the park. Its history could create the impression that the park’s problems are simply too difficult to tackle, but this is not the case.

13.2 The very high level of investment offered by the Parks for People programme reflects the HLF’s belief that the proposals for the park are well founded and will bring about a step change in use that benefits local people. 2016 is the 20th anniversary of their park funding programme and over the last two decades they have invested £800m to transform the fortunes of the most historic parks across the UK. Through experience the HLF knows what makes a park regeneration project successful.

13.3 The nearly £6 million of funding (including match funding) currently on offer would fund the delivery of the largest park investment project undertaken in our borough - a borough which already prides itself on the quality of its parks and public spaces. Over the last decade the Council has undertaken a number of award winning projects in parks that are focussed on providing welcoming spaces that meet the needs of our diverse population. The regeneration of Beckenham Place Park has the potential to surpass all of these.

13.4 The park could boast facilities unrivalled in this part of London. Through the regeneration programme the park would become a place of

   **Community** – providing environmental education, interpretation for visitors and an events programme that engages a wide range of local people

   **Nature** – providing a huge range of habitats, from ancient woodland and meadow to a river, wetland, and a lake

   **Heritage** – ensuring the restoration of several listed 18th century buildings to providing high quality facilities and a beautiful and historic setting for people to enjoy

   **Outdoor activity** – providing endless opportunities for health and fitness activities, including some not found elsewhere in the borough (high ropes, kayaking)

   **Relaxation** – providing a sense of being in the countryside, of having space which gives people the opportunity to unwind in an attractive landscape.
It is recognised that the closure of the golf course would represent a significant loss to a community of people across London, some of whom have enjoyed playing golf at Beckenham Place Park for decades. However, the Heritage Lottery Fund’s award offers an opportunity to decouple the park’s future success from the ailing fortunes of the golf industry and create a park that offers far more than golf. It will transform the park for the benefit of local people, enabling the creation of a destination which will be used and loved by thousands of residents throughout the borough and beyond.

14. **Background documents and Report Author**

Appendices:
1) Current masterplan – emerging landscape design for the park
2) Invitees to the 2014 consultation
3) 2014 Consultation results
4) Outcomes required by the Heritage Lottery Fund
5) Golf courses within half an hour’s drive of Beckenham Place Park
6) Responses to the questions posed by petitioners/ the ‘Save Beckenham 18’ campaign
7) Timeline to show golf course contracts and tenders since 2002-3
8) Movement and usage survey

If you require any further information about this report please contact Alison Taylor alison.taylor@lewisham.gov.uk
Key to proposed works

1. Existing park entrances: retain existing sign boards and improve interpretation signage.
2. Existing path upgrades: upgrade paths to support shared use for cycling and walking and provide access for all where possible.
3. Additional parkland path network.
4. Parkland restoration and historic view management: native tree planting, restoration of 18th century parkland landscaping as setting to south of the Mansion House.
5. Beckenham Place Mansion: landscape setting to be restored with existing main car park returned to grass.
7. Southend Lodge and depot: likely to be conserved with depot to be upgraded.
8. Tennis court and kitchen/formal gardens: existing poor quality tennis courts removed and area restored to walled kitchen garden. Formal gardens restored.

9. The Homesteads: restore the stable block and 18th century courtyard, to create a new activity hub including café, toilets and an environmental education centre.

10. Restored pleasure grounds and with play facilities.

11. Restored 18th century lake and willow carr/wet woodland habitat with boardwalks.

12. Existing park storage/depot area: cleared and restored to parkland.

13. Ash plantation: extensive tree management with clearance and appropriate planting (species to be determined).

14. Possible BMX tracks.

15. Elements of adventure play: along areas of redirected river course.

16. Old Bromley Road playground: replace, relocate and enhance.

17. Skatepark – new provision to be confirmed.

18. Old Bromley Road car park: reduce footprint, improve surfacing and screen planting.

19. Old Bromley Road: new kiosk/WC block.

A: Environment Agency River Ravensbourne project: flood alleviation measures providing new landscaped protective earth banking, new paths, timber boardwalks and river crossings and a wetland reed bed area.
Appendix 2

Invitees to the 2014 consultation to explore the extent to which local people supported continuation of golfing on the site:

Wide Horizons
Downham Community Project
London Play
SE London Green Chain Walk
Lewisham Cyclists
SuTrans
Age Exchange
Heart n Soul
Lewisham Young Women’s Resource Project
Downham Health & Leisure Centre
Magpie Dance
Lewisham & Greenwich Healthy Walks initiative
Thames 21
Representative from Bromley Council Parks team
Lewisham Youth Service
Young Mayor’s Advisers
Greenwich & Lewisham Young People’s Theatre
LEAN
Conisborough College
Sedgehill School
Pre-school Learning Alliance
Phoenix Community Housing
Beckenham Place Park Working Group
Friends of Beckenham Place Park
Friends of Woodland Walk
Braeside Golf Club
BPP Dog Walkers
Downham and Whitefoot Interagency
Goldsmiths Community Association
London Wildlife Trust
Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society
Glendale
Soroptimist International
Beckenham & Downham Millwall Community Association
Ten-em-bee
Southend Village Action Groups
Catford and Southend Resident Association
West Beckenham Resident Association
Grove Park Community Group
Beckenham Running Club
SGI Buddhist Faith Group
Seventh Adventist Church
Kings Church (Downham)
St John The Baptist Church
Teatro Vivo
Lewisham Local History Society
Lewisham Resident Associations
Rushey Green Time Bank
Local Assembly Coordinators
Lewisham Councillors (local wards)
Local MP

The various groups were invited to different events held at the following locations:

The Green Man x 2 full days
Downham Health and Lifestyles Centre
Downham Assembly
Whitefoot Assembly
Mayors Young Advisers
Youth Employment Network

Council officers spoke to around 300 people in total with about 175 people completing the questionnaire
Appendix 3 - Summary of 2014 Consultation on change at Beckenham Place Park

All respondents/all boroughs

**2014 totals all responses**

- Series 1, retain 18 hole course: 23%, 1, 23%
- Series 1, 9 hole course: 5%, 2, 5%
- Series 1, partial landscape restoration: 37%, 3, 37%
- Series 1, historic landscape restoration: 35%, 4, 35%

Lewisham residents only

**2014 totals Lewisham**

- Series 1, retain 18 hole course: 14%, 1, 14%
- Series 1, 9 hole course: 5%, 2, 5%
- Series 1, partial landscape restoration: 44%, 3, 44%
- Series 1, historic landscape restoration: 37%, 4, 37%

Out of borough responses

**2014 totals other boroughs**

- Series 1, retain 18 hole course: 35%, 1, 35%
- Series 1, 9 hole course: 4%, 2, 4%
- Series 1, partial landscape restoration: 28%, 3, 28%
- Series 1, historic landscape restoration: 33%, 4, 33%

16% of total respondents were golfers, compared to 10% adults playing golf nationally.
Appendix 4
Outcomes required by the Heritage Lottery fund for Parks for People projects

The difference we want to make

We describe the difference we want to make to heritage, people and communities through a set of outcomes. These are drawn directly from our research into what projects have actually delivered.

Your project will need to contribute towards the ten outcomes listed here. We will consider the quality of the outcomes that your project will achieve and anticipate that you will contribute to some more than others.

We describe the outcomes we value the most as 'weighted' outcomes.

We provide detailed descriptions of these outcomes in Section four: Project outcomes in Part four: Application form help notes. These tell you what changes we want to bring about with our funding, and include some suggestions of how you can measure them.

Outcomes for heritage:
With our investment, heritage will be:
- better managed
- in better condition
- better interpreted and explained
- identified/recorded

Outcomes for people:
With our investment, people will have:
- developed skills
- learnt about heritage
- volunteered time

Outcomes for communities:
With our investment:
- your local area/community will be a better place to live, work or visit
- negative environmental impacts will be reduced
- more people and a wider range of people will have engaged with heritage.
Appendix 5
Golf courses within half an hour’s drive of Beckenham Place Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>No. of miles away</th>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Approx time taken to drive there from BPP</th>
<th>Visitors allowed?</th>
<th>Standard price for visitors (not twilight rates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortlands golf club</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10 holes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>With member or as part of a society only</td>
<td>Not advertised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Park golf club</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td>Weekdays only</td>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundridge Park golf club</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two 18-hole courses</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Weekdays only</td>
<td>From £45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich and Sydenham Hill golf club</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Weekdays only</td>
<td>From £40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley golf centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9 holes</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Yes – public course</td>
<td>From £25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Park golf club</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>19 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Addington</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>19 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Blackheath golf club</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
<td>Weekdays only</td>
<td>From £40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham Warren golf club</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9 holes</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
<td>Weekdays only</td>
<td>From £20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addington Court Golf Centre</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 x 18-hole, 19-hole</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £15 for 18 holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addington Palace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>22 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooters Hill golf club</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selsdon Park</td>
<td>8.5 miles</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpington Golf Centre</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2 x 18-hole, 1 x 9-hole</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>£24 for 18 holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kent golf club, Downe</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Weekdays only</td>
<td>From £55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Elms golf course</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>25 minutes</td>
<td>Yes - public course</td>
<td>From £24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsfield Lakes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18-hole and 9-hole</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £25 for 18 holes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broke Hill golf club</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>18 holes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>From £25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison, Beckenham Place Park golf course green fees start from £20 for adults.
Appendix 6
Questions posed by the ‘Save Beckenham 18’ campaign, prior to Scrutiny Committee, January 2016

1) **Given that it is possible to achieve nearly all the elements Lewisham Council wants for Beckenham Place Park with the golf course in place, and given that at the Beckenham Place Park Working Party meeting in May 2015 John Thompson of Greenscene stated that maintenance costs for the park are largely staff, and that he did not anticipate any reduction in staff if the golf course closes, would officers explain how losing golf income improves Lewisham Council’s financial situation and identify what replacement income streams are envisaged. (This detail is required by Heritage Lottery Fund by end of April 2016 so it should be readily available.)**

Use of the golf course has declined by 60% over the last 20 years and deriving a positive revenue stream from the remaining users has proved difficult. In 2010 the Council invited competitive tenders from golf providers for the management and maintenance of the golf course including restoration of the Homesteads. Only one provider of the 5 invited submitted a bid and that proposal subsequently proved unaffordable.

In the absence of a viable management, maintenance and investment package an interim contract was agreed with Glendale Golf, which involved transferring elements of course and catering management to them (including staff under TUPE and building costs) together with course income, in return for a fixed fee to the Council. This transfer of certain staff & building costs together with the risk on the level of income allowed the Council to achieve a modest level of investment in the course and café offer whilst achieving greater certainty on income and expenditure for the parks service, whose budgets were under pressure.

The income the Council receives under the contract is far lower than the cost of maintaining and managing the course. If the course were to close then the significant staff time spent on its maintenance could be used to manage the east side of the park which would yield a saving in the Glendale parks contract. In addition specialist equipment for maintaining the course would no longer need to be hired or purchased, yielding further savings.

Council officers envisage generating future revenues primarily through letting buildings within the park – the homesteads, the ‘cottages’ within the eighteenth century courtyard, the Foxgrove Club and eventually the mansion. Further income may also be generated through holding events in the park, or through commercial operation of outdoor activities such as kayaking or high ropes. The ‘Round 2’ submission will model this alternative income and be submitted to the HLF in August 2016.

Access to capital funding as a result of opening up the park for greater use is the primary benefit resulting from the change. The £4.9 million funding awarded is the equivalent of 76 years income from the current golf arrangements and offers an opportunity to restore and repurpose the listed buildings. The vision for the park also creates the foundation for a further bid for funds to restore the mansion, which is likely to cost a further £3-4 million.

2) **In the event that the scheme currently proposed by the Regeneration Department were to be approved, what is the detailed breakdown of income per annum that will be delivered by the intended "improvements" and what is the corresponding annual cost anticipated for maintenance of the park?**
The likely level of income per year has yet to be fully modelled, as it is dependent on a range of factors.

The maintenance cost of the park cannot be defined until the designs for the park have progressed further.

A ten year management and maintenance plan, forecasting both income and costs is required by the HLF as part of the Round 2 submission, to demonstrate how improvement will be sustained. This will be prepared in line with the final design ready for submission in August 2016.

3) Based upon the Council’s own (disputed as low) golf course usage figures, the golfing community is currently paying approximately £350,000 per annum to Glendale to use the golf course in Beckenham Place Park (plus café income from golfers.) Noting that the Council pay the maintenance costs could someone please explain why such a disadvantageous sub-contract with the golf course and café operator (Glendale) has been negotiated and why no steps are being taken to openly compete this service provision, even though suitably qualified service providers are currently expressing interest in delivering a mutually financially advantageous arrangement. There is established precedent for this approach in other London Boroughs.

The golf course generates significantly lower income than £350,000. Historically, people making use of Beckenham Place Park’s golf course have had a tendency to seek out the better value green fee offers and to pursue membership offers which reduce the costs to regular players.

The current Glendale contract was put in place in 2012, following two harsh winters, which led to a low in the number of rounds played each year (16,500), as an interim measure whilst regeneration plans for the park were developed. The Council wished to transfer risk to the golf operator, to enable certainty in financial planning and ensure appropriate maintenance of the park in the meantime. The following three tables show how much the golf course was losing individually, then in combination with the café. The final table shows the lower level of loss incurred under the less risky interim management arrangements designed to allow better budgeting for the parks service.
Golf costs versus income 2011/12 (the last full financial year prior to the 3 year contract with Glendale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs attributed to golf</td>
<td>171,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens and tees mowers</td>
<td>18,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid fuel pertaining to golf</td>
<td>1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business rates</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation for the course</td>
<td>15,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds maintenance items for the course (eg topsoil, turf, dressings, herbicide etc)</td>
<td>28,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, furniture and materials</td>
<td>8,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale management fee</td>
<td>120,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of golf course to Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>385,035</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from green fees</td>
<td>178,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cost to council of golf operation</strong></td>
<td><strong>-£206,660</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Golf costs versus income 2015/16 projection (under interim management arrangements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs attributed to golf</td>
<td>157,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens and tees mowers</td>
<td>11,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid fuel pertaining to golf</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business rates</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation for the course</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds maintenance items for the course (eg topsoil, turf, dressings, herbicide etc)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, furniture and materials</td>
<td>13,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of golf course to Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,910</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from golf operator</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cost to council of golf operation</strong></td>
<td><strong>-£148,910.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On golf alone the change in management arrangements reduces the subsidy by £57,750 per annum (or roughly a 28%) saving to the Council resulting from the change.

The next table shows the effect of the café which is also bound up in the changed management arrangements.
Golf and café costs versus income 2011/12 (the last full financial year prior to the 3 year contract with Glendale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs attributed to golf</td>
<td>£171,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens and tees mowers</td>
<td>£18,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid fuel pertaining to golf</td>
<td>£1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business rates</td>
<td>£19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation for the course</td>
<td>£15,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds maintenance items for the course (eg topsoil, turf, dressings, herbicide etc)</td>
<td>£28,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, furniture and materials</td>
<td>£8,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale management fee</td>
<td>£120,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café staff costs (excluding management overheads)</td>
<td>£51,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café supplies</td>
<td>£25,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises cost (a notional charge linked to the sum Glendale agreed to pay under the contract)</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of golf course and café to Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>£468,006</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from green fees</td>
<td>£178,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from café</td>
<td>£36,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income from golf and café</strong></td>
<td><strong>£214,702</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cost to council of golf and café operation</strong></td>
<td><strong>-£253,304</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. even with only a notional premises cost and no management overheads included in the café costs, the outgoings (£82,971) far outweigh the income of £36,327 making a loss of £46,644 in the 2011/12 financial year.

The saving to the Council from this alternative arrangement is in the region of £100k p.a. and over the 4 years of interim management the change is likely to have saved the parks service in the region of £400,000.

As explained in the answer to 1) above, the Council’s last attempt to contract out golf management and maintenance and achieve the necessary investment in the listed buildings yielded very little interest and the only tender received was subsequently discovered to be unaffordable. Since this time the condition of the listed stable has declined dramatically following an arson attack on the building in 2011 and the challenge of achieving the necessary investment has increased considerably.

The Council is also looking to secure investment for the park and the listed buildings within it. As golf inhibits the ability to access core funding from organisations like the HLF we would expect any commercial golf partners to bring the necessary investment. Our previous
unsuccessful attempts at marketing the opportunity attempting to raise only a modest amount of capital investment proved completely unaffordable.

Whilst it may be possible to negotiate a more financially advantageous contract with an alternative operator, it should be noted that:

- Golf is in decline nationally, and there are 18 courses within half an hour’s drive of Beckenham Place Park.
- Many Councils have had to shut down golf courses or reduce their subsidy in the last two years: Lewisham is not the only local authority to spend more than it receives in income on its golf course and to be faced with a decision on what to do about it. Unlike other Council’s in the same position Lewisham has a £4.9 million grant on offer to invest in improvements following closure of the course.
- Any income which could be gained from the course will be at risk of poor weather and further decline in the popularity of the sport.

Officers believe that there are more resilient sources of income that could be achieved from the park and its buildings than that offered by golf. These alternative sources of income are not burdened with such significant maintenance costs and represent a lower risk to tightly stretched park budgets.

4) Which elements of the "new" user community will contribute to the running costs and what is the additional annual cost?

As with almost all parks there is no plan to charge the users for the enjoyment of the space. If they decide to utilise the new café, then through their patronage they will be supporting the rental income the Council receives from the café operator. In time, as other buildings are restored, they will find new occupiers and it is stable income from these occupiers which will support the park's running costs.

5) Given that the Heritage Lottery Fund case paper to its Trustees (based on Lewisham Council's application form) says that there will be a "Sporting programme in partnership with Greenwich Tritons Triathlon Club" could the Officers explain:-

- How that partnership will work; what those sports will be?

- How the niche and expensive sport of Triathlon will be more accessible to local residents than the public golf course?

- What new sports introduced into the park will provide a positive revenue stream and which elements will incur net cost?

- What is the projected financial contribution of Greenwich Tritons towards maintenance of the lake to a high enough standard to accommodate the Triathlon discipline of swimming and have Greenwich Tritons endorsed this prediction?

- Have the costs of the onerous ongoing health and safety obligations of introducing a lake into the park been included in the annual maintenance costs?
Our aim is to enable a range of sporting activities and for most of these to be free for visitors to enjoy. Most activities like walking, cycling and running incur little or no extra cost to the Council, so unlike golf there is no need to seek payment to cover costs. Activities under consideration include:

- Family cycling/mountain bike elements
- Kayaking and topper sailing for children (with Wide Horizons)
- Orienteering, low and high ropes
- New running and walking routes including weekly Park Run
- Exploring the possibility of open water swimming

Some of these activities may generate modest income but without significant maintenance costs. The cost of the lake will be factored into the costs for the park.

6) Given that the new “masterplan” for the park shows a large events space in the west to be spread over half a dozen holes of the golf course, and given that there is no viable access for deliveries of equipment for events to that space (the Mansion House has to be kept clear of vehicles in keeping with its 18C setting), and given that the same problem applies to parking for large numbers of extra visitors, can officers explain:

- How realistic is it to have an events space there?
- Who has expressed interest in hiring that space?
- What is the detailed breakdown of anticipated income per annum of the currently proposed events scheme and what is the corresponding annual cost anticipated? (HLF require a 10 year plan for all costings.)
- Have those who have expressed an interest in hiring the events space endorsed the costings?
- There may be a bund created in the east of the park as part of the Flood Alleviation Scheme which would lend itself to a natural amphitheatre and there is easy vehicular access, so why is the focus of this aspect of the current scheme in the western part of the Park? (The FAS is expected to come into play only once in every 65 years.)

A variety of events could take place in the park and different settings could be used depending on the nature of the event and its particular requirements. Factors like access for setting up and clearing at the end of an event will be considered as part of the planning for each event. As work to the park is some years from completion we have not yet marketed the park for events but two events managers have approached the Council with an interest in developing proposals which they feel will be successful. The Council has experience of managing spaces for events successfully and will bring this to bear when the scheme is completed.

The management and maintenance plan will outline any assumptions made about events income and expenditure and will be prepared for submission with the Stage 2 bid to the HLF.

7) Given that the HLF case paper says there will be a "Learning programme to include Forest Schools in partnership with Wide Horizons, and more informal activities such as nature walks and pond dipping, and given that Wide Horizons brought 150 children from Tower Hamlets..."
into the park on 2 July 2015 for a field study and coexisted with the golf course, and given that
the park is 237 acres and the golf course only takes up 90 acres, would officers explain:-

- Why the golf course has to make way for Wide Horizons when both communities could easily co-
exist?

- What income from Wide Horizons has been assumed and have Wide Horizons endorsed this
prediction?

Some environmental education can and does take place around the golf course. However, local
schools in the survey we have undertaken identified several barriers to using the park for
environmental education currently, these include:

- **No facilities in case of bad weather, no indoor learning space, nowhere to eat lunch.**
  However, the HLF scheme enables restoration of the 18th Century stable block offering a
  fantastic base for schools activities as well as a new café and toilets for the general public

- **Lack of clear communication, learning resources and experienced people to lead outdoor
activities.** However, the HLF scheme will enable Wide Horizons to provide a new learning
  base for local schools to benefit from outdoor education and teambuilding activities. It will
  be staffed by experienced outdoor learning co-ordinators with the necessary resources to
  make this a practical and cost effective way to bring the curriculum to life for local
  children.

The golf course does not have to make way for environmental education but its dominance of
space does inhibit use of a large area around the visitor hub for education or other uses.

The Council does not expect to generate income from the provision of environmental education
and our focus is primarily on creating a sustainable resource for local schools and children to
enrich their education.

8) The HLF case paper refers to volunteer programmes and apprenticeships, would officers
please explain why this cannot be achieved with the golf course in place?

The proposed apprenticeship programmes are supported by HLF funding and whilst it is possible
to deliver apprenticeships with the golf course in place it is unlikely that HLF funding would be
forthcoming if the course remained open, as it inhibits use by the wider public.

9) Would officers explain why:-

- They terminated the processing of the tender bid from Beckenham Place Community Trust to
  lease the Mansion House and restore it to community use whilst accommodating the operation
  of the golf course (and which would likely to have been achieved by now) and has the council
  developed its own plan to renovate the Mansion House?

The Council decided to attempt to develop a holistic vision for the park, which would resolve the issues
with the park and buildings, rather than attempting to restore the mansion alone.

We have now secured funding for the restoration of 3 out of the 4 listed buildings in the park. We have
also been participating in the HLF’s mansions working group, which shares best practice from
completed projects to support the development of new proposals for buildings that they would like to
see restored and repurposed. The HLF have indicated their desire to see a proposal for the restoration of the mansion in due course and we will tackle this next phase as the project progresses.
### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-3</td>
<td>38,500 rounds a year&lt;br&gt;£350,000 income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>21,800 rounds&lt;br&gt;Overspending park budget due to loss of golf income&lt;br&gt;Mayer and Cabinet contracts allocated additional £140k pa towards Beckenham Place Park (from other parks contractual savings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>5 companies invited for the management and maintenance of parkland and golf course to include investment to restore the homesteads cottages and outbuildings. One tender returned. Unaffordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>May – negotiations to vary golf course maintenance into existing parks contract. Unaffordable.&lt;br&gt;21,000 rounds played&lt;br&gt;Park budget overspent by £31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Council considers other possibilities to mitigate risk of fluctuating and declining golf income&lt;br&gt;16,500 rounds played, £149k golf income&lt;br&gt;Park budget overspent by £130k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
<td>Glendale Golf signed existing interim arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
<td>Interim arrangement extended for one year to end Dec 2016 (or earlier by agreement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8

Movement & usage survey (available as separate PDF)
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Located two miles South of Catford and one mile North West of Bromley, Beckenham Place Park is the largest green space of the London Borough of Lewisham, covering an area of approximately 98 hectares.

The park is considered as one the best wildlife sites in the borough, containing ancient woodland and many distinct habitats. It is a local nature reserve and a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. It is also part of the Green Chain Walk and Capital Ring.

In preparation for the submission of funding bids to the Heritage Lottery Fund and others for significant investment in the park and buildings, the Council wishes to conduct a baseline survey to determine current levels of use and is interested in understanding:
- the flow of people through the entrances and the zones of the park.
- the level of movement between the East and West side of the park.
- what the park is being used for and who by.
- the level of use of the different areas of the park.
Context

Bisected by a railway, the park consists of a large open space, woodland, water habitats, an 18 hole public golf course, playground and a number of heritage assets of historic interest, two of which (the Mansion and Homestead) are currently listed on the English Heritage’s ‘historic buildings at risk register’.

For the sake of convenience, the 9 official entrances of Beckenham Place Park will be called by the following numbers in the document:
- 1: East of railway near Beckenham Hill station
- 2: West of railway near Beckenham Hill station
- 3: Outside Southend Road
- 4: Beckenham Place Park dead end
- 5: Westgate Road
- 6: Crab Hill
- 7: Ravensbourne Avenue
- 8: Old Bromley Road South
- 9: Old Bromley Road North.
METHODOLOGY

The previous research findings provides a good background to people’s views about the park and will form an important part of the information required both to produce a vision for the park and as necessary background for the HLF bid. Our knowledge of the park suggests that is very much underused, however represents a great potential to raise its profile, attractions and visitor numbers.

Although the previous survey reached out and captured thoughts of people through face to face interviews, stakeholder meetings, questionnaire returns and online feedback it was still difficult to actually develop a clear picture of how many people actually use the park and how.

Therefore, the following information have been gathered to complement the findings to date:

Quantitative:
- The actual numbers of people using the park across a week day and weekend.
- The current catchment area of the park.

Qualitative:
- How these people are using the park.
- How these people are moving through the park.
- How the numbers of visitors and movements compare with other parks within the borough.

Recording actual numbers of visitors:

We fixed cameras on lamp columns or tree trunks at all of the 9 entrances from Thursday 15/08/13 to Sunday 18/08/13, with an addition camera on the bridge link across the railway. This recorded as a video all the movements in and out of the park.

We then analysed these to obtain actual numbers using each entrance over a key 6 hour period:
- from 10 am to 4 pm on the 15/08/13.
- from 10 am to 4 pm on the 18/08/13.

We ensured that the weather was suitable to count a significant and typical amount of visitors flow.

The current catchment area:

This was a desktop survey based on walking distances from each of the gates. Using the Lower Layer Super Output Area data from the ONS 2011 Census, we determined approximate populations within a suggested 10 minute perimeter of each gate and the overall park. Merging this with the actual visitor numbers, we established what percentage of the walking distance population actually are using the park.

How people are using and moving through the park:

On the 17/08/13 (weekend day) and 21/08/13 (week day), we analysed peoples movement within the park. Two people were based in the park and observed peoples use and movements along with asking a simple questionnaire to a selection of the users. This developed a further understand on the trends and current use. We spent time in all of the different zones and recorded use and movement which complement the figures obtained from the camera survey. We identified key routes within the park and the most and least used areas. We also undertook a serie of 90 snap shots throughout both days, recording how many people were visible at once from 15 selected viewpoints.

How the numbers of visitors and movements compare with other parks within the borough:

This was a key finding to determine overall usage levels in the park compared with others within the borough. We spent a day in Ladywell Fields (15/08/13, same weekday as the videos were recording in Beckenham) with snap shot footfall counts for selected periods throughout the day at the key entrances and movement paths. This was done manually with ped counters.

Two people were based in the park and also observed peoples use and movements.

We undertook the same desktop survey to determine the current catchment area of Ladywell Fields and compare it with Beckenham Place Park.
HOW PEOPLE ARE USING THE PARK?

DISTRIBUTION OF USERS IN THE PARK

Bisected by a railway, the park usage is significantly divided into a West side widely devoted to the golf playing and an East side, more diverse but mostly used by people walking their dog alongside the Ravensbourne river and people using the children playground.

Popularity of the different areas:
• The Children Play Area seems to be by far the busiest area of Beckenham Place Park. However, its use is very dependant on the weather and the time (it is much less used during the weekend and starts to be used only from late morning). The facility is used both as a playing area and a place to have a picnic, lie down and look after the children. At peak time, it looks unfit to receive that amount of people. The surrounding area remains extremely quiet at anytime.
• The terrasse outside the Mansion, which overlook most of the golf course, represent the second most popular area in the park. People get ready to play golf or stay there for a drink, waiting for friends, after having played golf, or just looking at the players. The frequency clearly drops from around 4 pm.
• A few areas (including the Ornemental Garden, the little ‘park’ by the tennis courts and the small area in between the fairways, off the Capital Ring) seem to be very appreciated and used by a wider range of users. They all offer a mix of sun/shadow, some privacy, benches and globally a warmer atmosphere.
• The fields (the Common, Summerhouse Field, Railway Field, Crab Hill Field and The Paddock) are massively underused:
  - Overall, always very quiet, except maybe the Common on Saturday morning for 1 or 2 hours. Most of the time, they give the impression of endless blank spaces.
  - Monofunctionality: clear predominance of dog walking in the usages.
  - Very low amount of users who play, stop/stay/sit down or meet up there with friends.
• The footpaths through the Woodland areas (Ash Plantation and Summerhouse Hill Wood) are also very quiet throughout the day and seem to be mostly used by dog walkers. No uses have been recorded in the Woodlands themselve.
• Overall, the park appears to be very much underused, especially because of:
  - a lack of attractions and features (acute in the fields and the woodlands)
  - a few unusable and/or derelict facilities (the pond, two of the tennis courts, the wooden house in between the tennis courts, the Homesteads, the Garden Cottage, the Children Centre and the changing rooms).
  - the presence of large areas out of bounds.
  - woodlands that are difficult to navigate and feel unsafe to some users. These disadvantages are all suppressing the number of people who engage with the park.

Conflict of use:
• A few conflict of use seem to exist (though not clearly observed):
  - Between dog walkers and cyclists, which are said to cycle too fast and be dangerous for dogs and people on the main track along the river.
  - Between golf players and walkers/dog walkers, who crosses the fairways while they are playing.
HOW PEOPLE ARE USING THE PARK?

The Children Play Area, an irregular busy facility

A few popular areas

A serie of blank fields

Unusable and derelict facilities
HOW PEOPLE ARE MOVING THROUGH THE PARK?

KEY ROUTES WITHIN THE PARK

The cycle and footpath going North/South along the river is the most used track within the park and also the one with the highest diversity of users (walkers, dog walkers, joggers, people with pushchairs). Its use is very concentrated on a few peak hours (in the morning from approximately 10 am to 12 pm and in the afternoon from 2 to 4 pm).

A natural route all along the river, off the main path, from the footbridge to the entrance 7 is very popular among dog walkers. A couple of ‘spots’ are devoted to dog playing/swimming and people stopping/chatting for a few minutes.

A lot of other natural routes have been recorded in the East side of the park:

- A natural route all along the river, off the main path, from the footbridge to the entrance 7 is very popular among dog walkers. A couple of ‘spots’ are devoted to dog playing/swimming and people stopping/chatting for a few minutes.
- A lot of other natural routes have been recorded in the East side of the park:
  - a few shortcuts across the Common from the West to the East.
  - a route along the railway, through the woodland, all the way down to the end of Summerhouse Field.
  - a loop track South of the car park.
  - and a shortcut linking the entrance 1 and the railway bridge.

On the West side of the park, the road between the entrance 2 and the Mansion is the busiest route. Leading directly to the golf course car park, it is therefore mostly used by cars.

The winding footpath between the Mansion and the Ornemental Garden is the most popular route for pedestrians.

The path from the Mansion to the entrance 4 is also quite popular. However the route is not very convenient for cyclists or people with wheel/pushchair: the entrance gate is very narrow and the surfacing is very damaged (then a most of cyclists dismount in that section).

As a general rule, people mainly move through the defined tracks in that side of the park, though a few natural pedestrian routes have also been noticed:

- two shortcuts crossing the Paddock.
- three shortcuts from the entrance 6 to Railway Field and Crab Hill Field.
- a path going to the golf course through the old burning ground.
- a route linking the entrance 5 to the Summerhouse Hill Wood via Crab Hill Field.
- movements have been recorded within the golf course, but they are too scattered to identify any significant route.

The footpaths through the Ash Plantation and the Summerhouse Hill Wood are very quiet and are hard to navigate (partly because of a lack of signage and the overgrown woodland understorey). No natural routes have been noticed in these woodlands.

The Capital Ring does not seem to be a key route within the park.
HOW PEOPLE ARE MOVING THROUGH THE PARK?

The N/S cycle/footpath and the riverside, main track of Beckenham Place Park

Natural routes within the East side of the park

Key routes in the West side... ... and less used tracks

Natural routes within the West side of the park
WHICH ARE THE MOST USED ENTRANCES?

The entrance 2 is the most frequently used gate, with almost one fifth of the total flows (19%).

65% of the flows through this entrance are made by car and are undoubtedly in relation to the use of the golf course.

35% of the flows from the entrance 9 are also made by car. This gate offers the most convenient access to the river and the main track.

A consistent distribution of the flows over most of the entrances: 6 gates between 10% and 13% of the movements.

Very little use of the entrances 9 and 3, which only gather 6% of the movements each.

The two busiest entrances are also the only two where it is possible to come through by car (they both lead to a car park within the park).

It seems that there is no relation between the level of flows and the proximity of a main road or a train station: entrance 1 and 3, located on Beckenham Hill Road and just off Beckenham Hill station, come 6th and last. Entrance 4, located on a dead end and 9 minutes away from the nearest station, is the third busiest gate.

No significant difference has been noticed in the distribution of flows between the two days or between the inflow and outflow. Details are provided in page 23.
When is the Park Used?

**Total Entry by Hour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday 15.08.13</th>
<th>Tuesday 16.08.13</th>
<th>Wednesday 17.08.13</th>
<th>Thursday 18.08.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 am</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 am</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points**

- A general very low visitors number: the maximum hourly inflow is only 206 pp during the weekend (18.08.13) and just over 100 pp for a weekday (15.08.13).
- From 10 am to 4 pm, only 480 people visited the park on the weekday and 1130 on the weekend day.
- There are twice as many visitors on a weekend day than on a weekday.
- For both days, the peak hours are from 10 am to 11 am and the number of entries starts to fall from 3 pm.
- Except the morning peak, trends are different:
  - On the weekday, there is a continuous decrease of people getting to the park from 11 am to 2 pm, when the number of visitors starts to rise, reaching its second peak time between 2 pm and 3 pm.
  - With only 63 visitors entering between 12 pm and 1 am and 55 between 1 am and 2 pm, we can consider that there is no lunch break trend in Beckenham Place Park during the week.
  - During the weekend, changes in the visitors flows are less intense but more frequent: two off-peak hours (late morning and from 1 pm to 2 pm) and two busier times (between 12 pm and 1 pm, and 2 pm and 3 pm).
- The park seems to have a very short daily usage period: uses before 10 am and after 5 pm are very marginal (and concentrated on the Children Play Area) and no afterwork trend has been noticed.
WHAT DO PEOPLE DO IN THE PARK?

The data collected from these ‘snapshots’ give a better picture of the typical activities and atmosphere in Beckenham Place Park. Covering the Children Play Area, the viewpoint N is unsurprisingly the standing position from where the highest average number of people (almost 23) can be seen, most of them playing in the playground or looking after children.

The standing position J, overlooking most of the golf course from the Mansion terrace, is the second place from where a significant average amount of users is visible (18). Covering a very wide area, the concentration of users remains low and the atmosphere very quiet.

Except these two exceptional situations, the average number of users is very low from any viewpoint (it never exceeds 9 people).

Overall, playing golf and dog walking are by far the two main and almost exclusive activities in Beckenham Place Park.

Most of the areas can be considered as monofunctional, as the other activities are not intense enough to represent significant trends. In the Common, which is the most ‘diverse’ area, running, sitting, cycling only gather less than one person on average. And no other people have been recorded playing sports except a big group playing football on a weekend morning.

Crab Hill Field and the Paddock (viewpoints F and L) appear to be the most underused areas of the park.

19% of the counts (17/90) did not record any user, which means that in many instances the different areas of the park are completely blank.
WHAT IS THE PARK CATCHMENT AREA?

The ten minute walk area from Beckenham Place Park includes:
- 9 preschools/nurseries.
- 7 primary schools.
- 3 secondary schools (incl. high school and college).
- 4 health/social care centres.
- 1 community centre and 1 school of performing arts and theatre school.
- 3 sport and leisure facilities.
- 2 public parks.

The park is also easily accessible by train, with two stations (Beckenham Hill and Ravensbourne) located right next to a park entrance and an additional one (Beckenham Junction) within a ten minute walk distance.

Overall, these facilities represent a very high potential of users.
WHAT IS THE PARK CATCHMENT AREA?

CATCHMENT AREA PER ENTRANCE

A wide ten minute walk area (approx. 364 ha) is covered by the existing entrances of Beckenham Place Park.

Half of the area is actually accessible from at least two gates at the same time: the park has a large and fine coverage and the walking distance population can chose between a couple of entrances to get into the park.

The entrances 8/9 cover the widest area, which partly explains why the gate 8 has the second largest flow of visitors.

The South gates (4, 5, 6 and 7) have a smaller coverage, because of the railway lines and the specific features of the street network. Therefore, a little part of the population who live within a short bird’s eye distance is not included in the park catchment area.

An area on the East side of the park remains inaccessible: no entrance is proposed between the gates 8 and 7 (distant from more than 700 m) and two private sport facilities cut off the residential streets and the park (Millwall FC training ground and Ten-em-Bee Sport Development Centre).
BECKENHAM PLACE PARK vs LADYWELL FIELDS

TOTAL ENTRY BY HOUR ON A WEEKDAY (15.08.13)

Beckenham Place Park
Ladywell Fields
Incl. missing data

TIME
10-11 am 11-12 pm 12-1 pm 1-2 pm 2-3 pm 3-4 pm
NUMBER OF PEOPLE GETTING IN
0 50 100 150 200 250 300 350

Aggregate count of visitors getting in Beckenham Place Park and Ladywell Fields through the official entrances between 10am and 4pm, on the 15.08.13.

TOTAL ENTRY FROM 10AM TO 4PM ON A WEEKDAY

Mixed activities in Ladywell Fields on a weekday (15.08.13)

KEY POINTS

• Important notice: Data in Ladywell Fields have been collected manually with ped counters at the key entrances (North gates near Ladywell Road, South gates around Adenmore Road and South West gates along Ravensbourne park). The entrances near the University Hospital Lewisham, the footbridge and the Ladywell Arena have not been covered. Therefore, a significant amount of flows has not been taken into account. Any comparison with Beckenham Place Park should be made with care and a 30% additional inflow could realistically be allowed on the top of the current data (shown as dashed lines on the chart).
• Considering the current available data, visitors flow is on average three times higher in Ladywell Fields than in Beckenham Place Park, at anytime.
• Similarities: mid-morning and early afternoon peak hours can be noticed for both parks, as well as a clear decrease of flow from 11 am to 1 pm.
• However, in Ladywell Fields, the number of visitors starts to rise again from 1 pm. The peak hour is from 2 to 3 pm and the inflow remains almost as high between 3 and 4 pm.
• The biggest gaps are for the 1-2 pm and 3-4 pm time slots: it clearly highlights the underuse of Beckenham Place Park during lunch time and the afternoon play time.
**BECKENHAM PLACE PARK vs LADYWELL FIELDS**

**PEOPLE LIVING WITHIN A 10 MINUTE WALK FROM A PARK ENTRANCE**

- Approximately 16,500 people live within a 10 minute walk distance from a Beckenham Place Park entrance, while there are 27,300 around Ladywell Fields.
- This gap can be explained by the higher population density in the Ladywell Fields area: 96 people per hectare against 62 people per hectare around Beckenham Place Park.
- Merging this information with the actual visitor numbers of the parks gives the evidence that Beckenham Place Park remains much less used than Ladywell Fields, even if there is a higher walking distance population around Ladywell Fields:
  - 2.9% of the walking distance population are actually using Beckenham Place Park between 10 am and 4 pm on a weekday,
  - while they are 4.7% using Ladywell Fields (considering the missing data, this rate can realistically be assessed at around 6%).
- Yet Beckenham Place Park almost offers a five times larger area than Ladywell Fields to visitors. Taking the area of the parks into account reveals an even higher gap in the density of use of the two green spaces:
  - on a weekday, the visitor density is less than 5 people per hectare in Beckenham Place Park,
  - when there are about 59 people per hectare in Ladywell Fields (and around 77 considering the missing data). Therefore, the relative density of use is 12 to 15 times greater in Ladywell Fields than in Beckenham Place Park.

**Ladywell Fields catchment area:**
- The ten minute walk area from Ladywell Fields includes:
  - 10 preschools/nurseries.
  - 5 primary schools.
  - 4 secondary schools (incl. high school and college).
  - 10 health/social care centres.
  - 4 social and cultural facilities.
  - 2 sport and leisure facilities.
  - 4 public parks, including the very appreciate Hilly Fields Park.
- The park is easily accessible by train, with three stations (Ladywell, Catford and Catford Bridge) located right next to a park entrance.
- Overall, Beckenham Place Park and Ladywell Fields have a very similar situation regarding their accessibility by the train and the public facilities included in their catchment area (especially for educational facilities). However, Ladywell Fields benefits from the direct proximity of the University Hospital Lewisham, which provides a significant amount of visitor flow in the North side of the park.
## COMPLETE DATA (SATURDAY 17.08.13 & WEDNESDAY 21.08.13)

### STANDING POSITIONS

#### AVERAGE NUMBER OF USERS VISIBLE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Walking</th>
<th>Cycling</th>
<th>Sitting</th>
<th>Running</th>
<th>Dog walking</th>
<th>Playing golf</th>
<th>Playing sports</th>
<th>With children</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>09:55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>09:35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>13:05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>14:15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>17:45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>14:15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>17:25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>17:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>11:55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17/08/2013</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TOTAL:** 40 7 73 9 127 162 28 184 625
### Standing Positions

#### Number of Users Visible on a Weekend Day (17.08.13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Position</th>
<th>Number of People Visible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Position</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of Users Visible on a Weekday (21.08.13)

- With children
- Playing sports
- Playing golf
- Walking dog
- Running
- Sitting
- Cycling
- Walking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions:** (Questions 1-10 are the same for all zones.)

1. What is your age? (Please circle one)
   - 18-24
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-54
   - 55-64
   - 65+

2. What is your sex? (Please circle one)
   - Male
   - Female

3. What is your occupation? (Please circle one)
   - Student
   - Worker
   - Retired
   - Self-employed
   - Unemployed

4. How often do you visit the park? (Please circle one)
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Monthly
   - Occasionally
   - Never

5. What is your primary reason for visiting the park? (Please circle one)
   - Exercise
   - Relaxation
   - Socializing
   - Nature appreciation
   - Other

6. What is your preferred activity in the park? (Please circle one)
   - Walking/jogging
   - Cycling
   - Picnicking
   - Fishing
   - Other

7. Do you have any special requirements or needs for using the park? (Please circle one)
   - Wheelchair access
   - Restrooms
   - Picnic areas
   - Play areas for children
   - Other

8. How would you rate the overall condition of the park? (Please circle one)
   - Excellent
   - Good
   - Average
   - Poor
   - Very poor

9. How would you rate the cleanliness of the park? (Please circle one)
   - Very clean
   - Clean
   - Average
   - Dirty
   - Very dirty

10. How would you rate the safety of the park? (Please circle one)
    - Very safe
    - Safe
    - Average
    - Not safe
    - Very not safe

**Comments:**

- Participants were asked to rate the conditions and facilities of the park.
- The survey was conducted in different zones to assess variations in usage.
- Responses were recorded and categorized for analysis.

**Coding:**

- Questionnaires were assessed and coded for further analysis.
- Data was compiled and analyzed to determine popular activities and feedback on park conditions.

**Results:**

- Overall satisfaction with the park's condition and facilities was rated highly by participants.
- Areas for improvement were identified, such as better maintenance and additional facilities.
- Recommendations for future improvements were made based on participants' feedback.

**Conclusion:**

- The survey provided valuable insights into park usage and user satisfaction.
- Further actions are planned to address identified areas for improvement.

---
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**BECKENHAM PLACE PARK**
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**QUESTIONNAIRES**
CAMERA SURVEY

Distribution of flows by entrance

**TOTAL VOLUME ON A WEEKDAY (15.08.13)**

**TOTAL VOLUME ON A WEEKEND DAY (18.08.13)**

**TOTAL VOLUME BY HOUR**

**ENTRY BOTH DAYS**

**EXIT BOTH DAYS**

Graphs showing the distribution of flows by entrance for different days and times.
LADYWELL FIELDS SURVEY

ENTRY BY HOUR ON A WEEKDAY (15.08.13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>North Entrances</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>SW Entrances</th>
<th>South Entrances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4pm</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12pm</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11am</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10am</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXIT BY HOUR ON A WEEKDAY (15.08.13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>North Entrances</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>SW Entrances</th>
<th>South Entrances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4pm</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12pm</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11am</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10am</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL VOLUME BY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Entrances</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Entrances</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Entrances</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL VOLUME BY HOUR

![Graph showing total volume by hour]
1. **Summary**

1.1 This report informs the Mayor and Cabinet of the comments and views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Beckenham Place Park report and petition, considered at its meeting on 14 January 2016.

2. **Recommendation**

2.1 Mayor and Cabinet is recommended to note the views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee as set out in this report.

3. **Sustainable Development Select Committee's views**

3.1 On 14 January 2016, the Sustainable Development Select Committee considered a report and petition on Beckenham Place Park.

3.2 The Committee resolved to advise Mayor and Cabinet of the following:

   - That the Committee felt that additional information should be provided on the current contract with Glendale regarding the maintenance and management of the golf course, prior to a decision by Mayor and Cabinet. This was to ensure that an analysis of the true profit potential could be made.

3.3 The Select Committee recommended that:

   The questions tabled by Councillor Curran and attached at Appendix A to this report, be referred to Mayor and Cabinet and officers be requested to ensure that their report to Mayor and Cabinet addresses these questions.

   The Mayor ensures he has sufficient information on the matters listed above at 3.2 before making his decision on Beckenham Place Park.

4. **Financial implications**

4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se; but there may financial implications arising from carrying out the action proposed by the Committee.

5. **Legal implications**

5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to refer reports to the Mayor and Cabinet, who are obliged to consider the report and the proposed response from
the relevant Executive Director; and report back to the Committee within two months (not including recess).

6. Further implications

6.1 At this stage there are no specific environmental, equalities or crime and disorder implications to consider. However, there may be implications arising from the implementation of the Committee’s recommendations.

Background papers

Report to Sustainable Development Select Committee, 14 January 2016, Item 3: Beckenham Place Park

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager (ext. 49446).
APPENDIX A

Questions submitted by Carole Hope – tabled by the Councillor Curran, Chair of Sustainable Development Select Committee

1) Given that it is possible to achieve nearly all the elements Lewisham Council wants for Beckenham Place Park with the golf course in place, and given that at the Beckenham Place Park Working Party meeting in May 2015 John Thompson of Greenscene stated that maintenance costs for the park are largely staff, and that he did not anticipate any reduction in staff if the golf course closes, would officers explain how losing golf income improves Lewisham Council’s financial situation and identify what replacement income streams are envisaged. (This detail is required by Heritage Lottery Fund by end of April 2016 so it should be readily available.)

2) In the event that the scheme currently proposed by the Regeneration Department were to be approved, what is the detailed breakdown of income per annum that will be delivered by the intended "improvements" and what is the corresponding annual cost anticipated for maintenance of the park?

3) Based upon the Council’s own (disputed as low) golf course usage figures, the golfing community is currently paying approximately £350,000 per annum to Glendale to use the golf course in Beckenham Place Park (plus café income from golfers.) Noting that the Council pay the maintenance costs could someone please explain why such a disadvantageous sub-contract with the golf course and café operator (Glendale) has been negotiated and why no steps are being taken to openly compete this service provision, even though suitably qualified service providers are currently expressing interest in delivering a mutually financially advantageous arrangement. There is established precedent for this approach in other London Boroughs.

4) Which elements of the "new" user community will contribute to the running costs and what is the additional annual cost?

5) Given that the Heritage Lottery Fund case paper to its Trustees (based on Lewisham Council’s application form) says that there will be a "Sporting programme in partnership with Greenwich Tritons Triathlon Club" could the Officers explain:-

- How that partnership will work; what those sports will be?

- How the niche and expensive sport of Triathlon will be more accessible to local residents than the public golf course?

- What new sports introduced into the park will provide a positive revenue stream and which elements will incur net cost?

- What is the projected financial contribution of Greenwich Tritons towards maintenance of the lake to a high enough standard to accommodate the Triathlon discipline of swimming and have Greenwich Tritons endorsed this prediction?

- Have the costs of the onerous on-going health and safety obligations of introducing a lake into the park been included in the annual maintenance costs?
6) Given that the new “master-plan” for the park shows a large events space in the west to be spread over half a dozen holes of the golf course, and given that there is no viable access for deliveries of equipment for events to that space (the Mansion House has to be kept clear of vehicles in keeping with its 18C setting), and given that the same problem applies to parking for large numbers of extra visitors, can officers explain:-

- How realistic is it to have an events space there?

- Who has expressed interest in hiring that space?

- What is the detailed breakdown of anticipated income per annum of the currently proposed events scheme and what is the corresponding annual cost anticipated? (HLF require a 10 year plan for all costings.)

- Have those who have expressed an interest in hiring the events space endorsed the costings?

- There may be a bund created in the east of the park as part of the Flood Alleviation Scheme which would lend itself to a natural amphitheatre and there is easy vehicular access, so why is the focus of this aspect of the current scheme in the western part of the Park? (The FAS is expected to come into play only once in every 65 years.)

7) Given that the HLF case paper says there will be a "Learning programme to include Forest Schools in partnership with Wide Horizons, and more informal activities such as nature walks and pond dipping, and given that Wide Horizons brought 150 children from Tower Hamlets into the park on 2 July 2015 for a field study and coexisted with the golf course, and given that the park is 237 acres and the golf course only takes up 90 acres, would officers explain:-

- Why the golf course has to make way for Wide Horizons when both communities could easily co-exist?

- What income from Wide Horizons has been assumed and have Wide Horizons endorsed this prediction?

8) The HLF case paper refers to volunteer programmes and apprenticeships, would officers please explain why this cannot be achieved with the golf course in place?

9) Would officers explain why:-

- They terminated the processing of the tender bid from Beckenham Place Community Trust to lease the Mansion House and restore it to community use whilst accommodating the operation of the golf course (and which would likely to have been achieved by now) and has the council developed its own plan to renovate the Mansion House?
Addendum to ‘Future of Beckenham Place Park’ Mayor and Cabinet Report, 17th February 2016–Equalities Analysis

Introduction

A report is being presented to Mayor and Cabinet on 17th February 2016 which recommends that the Mayor:

Approves the continuation of work on the restoration of Beckenham Place Park, and notes that this will include:

a) Public Consultation about park design and facilities
b) Ongoing design work and accompanying technical work by consultants, to be funded by the HLF grant.
c) Submission of a phase 2 bid to the HLF for approval of the detailed plans

Approves the closure of the existing golf course by 31st December 2016.

The aim of this assessment is to check whether the proposals (and/or any part of their implementation) is likely to have a positive or negative impact on different groups within our diverse community. Furthermore, it will assess whether or not there are actions which may be taken to prevent direct and indirect discrimination and positively promote harmonious community relations.

Assessment of relevant park user data and research

The information available about the protected characteristics of current park users is limited as it is not routinely collected. Where there is information available about current park users, this was collected as part of a usage survey carried out in November 2015. Data collected was based on a visual assessment carried out by the person carrying out the survey. Surveyors walked a specific route covering the park in an hour, and noted the people they saw. Hourly time slots from dawn till dark were allocated to surveyors on weekdays and weekend days to ensure full survey coverage on both a weekday and at the weekend.

There is no specific information available about golf users.

As the project progresses, additional data will be gathered about respondents to public consultation.

Assessment of key considerations/potential impacts

There is no data available on the protected characteristics of golfers at Beckenham Place Park and there is no suggestion that any group will be disproportionately affected by the closure of the golf course which is recommended in the report. It is also recognised at paragraph 5.4.5 and at Appendix 5 of the report, that there are a range of alternative golf courses within a 30 minute driving distance of the park and as such, the impact of the closure is limited. As such, this assessment will focus on the opportunities presented by the consultation and proposed regeneration of the park to promote equality and diverse use of the park.
**Age**

Age of park users from survey carried out in November 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total recorded</strong></td>
<td><strong>619</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the majority of the survey was conducted during school hours, and as such, the number of children should be expected to be understated.

**Key considerations/potential impacts:**

Older people -

The proposed regeneration of the park includes the improvement of path networks within the open space, allowing those older people with mobility problems the opportunity to explore the park safely and with confidence. It is expected that a figure of 8 path, taking park visitors through the extent of the open space, will also be accessible to mobility scooters.

Various organisations representing the interests of older people were invited to attend the consultation events in 2014. The details of these are set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

Footpaths and visitor facilities will be improved which will improve the experience of visitors of all ages to access the park.

Younger people –

Both the 2015 usage Survey and the 2014 Usage and Movement survey stated a surprisingly low number of children in the park. 31% of the local population are under 20 (Census, 2011), and the rejuvenation of the park will provide a much needed safe local space for them to use. It will also offer educational opportunities for local schools and adults, essential for an area where 27.2% of the population currently have no qualifications (Census, 2011).

Various organisations representing the interests of young people were invited to attend the consultation events in 2014. The details of these are set out in Appendix 2 of the report. Further consultation is being carried out specifically with children and young people during the development phase, as well as with schools, to ensure that the facilities in the park post-regeneration appeal to this audience and meet their needs. Many schools locally have expressed a desire to use the park regularly as part of their education.

New facilities which are particularly likely to attract children and young people to the park are:

- New play facilities on both the west and eastern sides of the park,
- Toilets and refreshment facilities on both sides of the park
- Cycle route
- Possible kayaking or boating on the proposed lake
- Woodland trails
Disability

Whilst this was recorded as part of the November 2015 Usage Survey, it is likely to be unreliable as the visual assessment would have only identified where people had visual clues that they have a disability, ie. They were in a wheelchair. Only one person was identified as having a disability by people carrying out the survey.

Key considerations/impacts:

Public consultation events should take place in venues which are accessible to ensure that regeneration plans for the park address the needs and desires of those with disabilities. Officers are keen that both the landscape and the activities offered cater for those with disabilities.

The sensory garden, which is already an established feature of the park, will be retained, and it is hoped that many more users will benefit from it through increased footfall in the park and increased marketing.

Currently, there is a main road into the park, which is accessible for wheelchairs and pushchairs up to the mansion house. Beyond this the pathways are not easily accessible, particularly in winter.

The project will improve the main pathways to ensure accessibility throughout the year. New toilets are also essential, with only one available currently. Neither the café nor the toilets are properly accessible currently and relocation to a fully accessible visitor centre, as outlined in the building plans attached, will enhance the visitor offer considerably and will support people with disabilities to visit the park.

Gender reassignment

There is no information available about current park users in relation to this protected characteristic.

Key considerations/impacts: None identified

Marriage and Civil Partnership

There is no information available about current park users in relation to this protected characteristic.

Key considerations/impacts: None identified

Race

Race of park users from survey carried out in November 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Background</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Column1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key considerations/impacts:

People from black and minority ethnic backgrounds are underrepresented in the park user survey carried out in November 2015 when compared to 2011 Census data, which found that 48% of the local population come from BME backgrounds. The Council will ensure that the public consultation carried out on the second stage bid, should the Mayor proceed with the recommendations, will target local community organisations which represent the interests of BME people to better understand the reasons for this underrepresentation.

Through the provision of more facilities and greater accessibility the project will enable the park to play an important part in developing and maintaining community cohesion.

**Religion or belief**

**Key considerations/impacts:**
Various organisations representing the interests of people with different religions and beliefs were invited to attend the consultation events in 2014. The details of these are set out in Appendix 2 of the report. Further consultation should be encouraged with all local community groups.

**Sex**

Sex of park users from survey carried out in November 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key considerations/impacts:**

Females were underrepresented in the usage survey carried out in November 2015, with 62% of park users found to be male. The regeneration proposals aim to broaden the range of activities at the park which will appeal to people of all sexes.

**Sexual orientation**

**Key considerations/impacts:** None identified

**Pregnancy and Maternity**

There is no information available about current park users in relation to this protected characteristic.

**Key considerations/impacts:**

The masterplan includes improved facilities at the park which will benefit parents who need to change or feed their children. Pathways throughout the park will be improved through the proposed regeneration, and this will have a benefit to parents using prams or buggies.
Addendum to Future of Beckenham Place Park Mayor and Cabinet Report. 17th February 2016

Officers have received the following ‘Rebuttal paper’ from ‘Save the Beckenham 18’. Comments of officers, where considered appropriate, have been provided in text boxes within the body of the paper for ease of reference.

A Rebuttal paper from ‘Save the Beckenham 18’ to the Officers ‘Future of Beckenham Place Park’ report produced for the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 17th February 2016

Executive summary

On Wednesday 17th February at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting you are asked by the regeneration officers to close the hundred year old heritage golf course; the second request is to agree to press ahead with Round 2 of the HLF bid.

The Mayor and his Councillors need to give serious consideration to the comments and evidence presented in this rebuttal paper to the ‘Future of Beckenham Place Park’ report produced by the regeneration officers.

The rebuttal has addressed the key issues and presents serious concerns about aspects of the application the Officers have made to the Heritage Lottery Fund. We believe the bid has been awarded at the first round due to the application containing inaccurate information; in essence it’s been awarded under ‘false pretences’ on two counts which we explain in this rebuttal. Firstly, the claim that the golf course loses money and secondly, the flawed consultation process at round One concerning the closure of the golf course and misleading interpretation of the questionnaire results.

The Council does not consider that the award has been made under false pretences. The financial position of the golf course is set out in detail at section 5.4 of the report.

The account of the consultation which took place prior to the HLF bid submission is presented accurately within the bid.

We have been in contact with the HLF chief executive Ms Carole Souter and understand from Ms Souter that in respect of the HLF board "It was noted by our board that Lewisham needed to carry out further work to help make decisions on the future of the golf course."

At a meeting of the Beckenham Place Park Working party (21st January) the conduit for park stakeholders with the LBC, Officer Alison Taylor advised the group present that no further consultations were due to be held in
respect of the closure of the golf course which contradicts what the HLF have advised and we seek the Mayor's view on this and the other serious issues raised?

The HLF did not advise that further consultation was required and there is no contradiction.

Usage and Movement study

In the application form to Heritage Lottery Fund it was stated that “A 2013 Movement and Usage Survey found the park to be extremely underused, especially when compared to other parks in Lewisham.” The Movement and Usage Survey only made a comparison with ONE other park. This is a deception.

The ONE other park that was used for comparison is Ladywell Fields. This is not a valid comparison for several reasons, not least because it adjoins Lewisham Hospital and staff, outpatients and visitors to the hospital have easy access for breaks and cut-through.

The comparison with Ladywell Fields was made because the Council had recently carried out a similar study at that park. The Council did not claim that Ladywell Fields is similar to Beckenham Place Park. All parks have their own unique characteristics and usage figures from other parks should therefore be used as broad comparison data only. Although the Movement and Usage Survey carried out in 2013 only compared the usage of Beckenham Place Park with Ladywell Fields, further comparisons are made in paragraph 5.1.4 of the report to other large urban parks.

The application form to Heritage Lottery Fund states “It was reported that the concentration of users remains low and the atmosphere very quiet.” The report based this assertion on “The standing position J, overlooking most of the golf course from the Mansion terrace, is the second place from where a significant average amount of users is visible.” This is untrue, you cannot see most of the golf course from the Mansion terrace. You can see less than half of the golf course. Therefore, a statement to Heritage Lottery Fund has been made based on fiction not fact.

It is accepted that the description of the view from standing position J was incorrect. However, this does not affect the findings of the survey, which took into consideration 15 vantage points and in particular covered other views of the golf course. The overall conclusion of the Survey is not affected.

The Movement and Usage Survey makes claims about the use of the Children Play Area, viewpoint N, which cannot be justified by reference to the timings contained in the Surveyors’ log in the report of when they were at viewpoint N or other viewpoints close by.
The Movement and Usage Survey allege there were ten video cameras used as part of the survey. “We fixed cameras on lamp columns or tree trunks at all of the 9 entrances from Thursday 15/8/13 to Sunday 18/8/13, with an addition (sic) camera on the bridge link across the railway. This recorded as a video all the movements in and out of the park. We then analysed these to obtain actual numbers over a key 6 hour period from 10am to 4pm on the 15/8/13 and 10am to 4pm on 18/8/13.” We dispute that 10am to 4pm in August is a key period for Beckenham Place Park.

Beckenham Place Park is open for twelve and a half hours in August, yet this expensive survey only analysed 6 hours per day use, for only two of the four days they were in place, and cut out all early morning and late afternoon users including golfers, many of whom arrive through the designated entrance much earlier than 10am or later than 4pm in August. This applies to walkers as well. In addition, Mr Gavin Plaskitt’s email confirms that the cameras could not distinguish the number of occupants arriving by car to the two car parks.

This Movement and Usage Survey is incapable of proving that “the park is extremely underused” as claimed in the application form to Heritage Lottery Fund.

The report was carried out by an independent third party commissioned by the Council who assessed that this was the key period based on their experience in this field. The Council has since conducted a further study using a different methodology, as set out in paragraph 5.1.4 of the report. Officers will continue to monitor park usage. Both the Movement and Usage Study and the Lewisham Council study indicate approximately 200,000 visits per year.

Flawed consultation process

In the Officers report section 5.3.5 and 5.3.6 they refer to the Consultation process and advise they spoke to 300 people. Of that number 175 of them completed a questionnaire. Those who participated were given four choices of which three included golf, 18 hole golf, 9 hole golf, Par 3 golf course the fourth option was for no golf and so called “Heritage” landscape. The way the survey/questionnaire was set up it was bound to split the results for golf, which is the true public heritage.

Of the total 175 questionnaires 62 people opted for the “Heritage” option with the majority wishing to see golf retained. So the undeniable fact is 65% of the sample was in favour of golf being retained. We can’t understand how the officers were able to justify in the application to the Heritage Lottery Fund that “It is clear from the results that there was general support for a radical reprioritisation of park use”
Paragraphs 5.3.5 and 5.3.6 of the report set out the questionnaire findings. In particular, that 77% of respondents favoured the cessation of 18-hole golf. It is acknowledged at paragraph 5.3.6 of the report that the majority of respondents did not opt for no golf, but that it was clear from the consultation that respondents did favour a park which was much more substantially public park and less substantially golf course.

Please note, also, that of the 10 (non golf) features that people ranked in order of importance, seven are achievable with the golf course in place, one of them was “Introduction of grazing animals” and one of them refers to the “restoration of the designed landscape” which is the landscape of the privileged 18th Century landed gentry, which is not the public heritage of the park and which, incidentally, has a 19th Century railway line running through it.

The Conservation Management Plan will be published in due course. Paragraph 5.3.8 of the report sets out the findings to date which are relevant to the decision being made.

The data has been manipulated by the Officers to disguise the truth of the results; that said they do acknowledge in the first line of section 5.3.6 “Although the majority of respondents did not opt for the ‘no golf’. The operative words being ‘did not’.

The data has not been manipulated.

The research was not robust, comprehensive and by Market Research Society governance flawed and cannot be seen as representative of public opinion.

There is no public mandate for closing the course.

The research carried out in 2014 was proportionate and appropriate to support the Stage 1 bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund. Details of the invitees and format can be found at Appendix 2 of the report. Further consultation has been carried out in relation to the design development. A wider public consultation is planned for the Heritage Lottery Fund Stage 2 bid, detailed in paragraph 5.6 of the report, should the Mayor decide to proceed with the recommendations contained within the report.

Considerable public opposition has been registered with the Mayor through the petition signed by over 5,700 people. In addition 890 protest letters and numerous objection letters and emails have been sent to the Mayor. This is addressed in section 5.5 of the report.

The ‘Friends of Beckenham Pace Park’; a volunteer group who run the visitor centre at the Mansion is jointly chaired by Mal Mitchell. Mr Mitchell on behalf of the Friends ran their own survey in autumn 2015. The survey had 400 questionnaires’ returned, the findings confirming that 60% wished to see the retention of golf.
The updated version of the research has been recently made available to the Mayor and is attached for your information.

We have attached the time-line to the consultation process which explains in detail the genuine concerns about the approach, for the reasons explained we do not believe the Mayor can rely on this consultation to judge public opinion to close the golf course

**Fact or fiction – golf course P&L transparency**

In the report, section 5.4 covers the key topic of the golf course; the critical issue facing the Mayor and the cabinet is the proposal to close the golf course.

In the Officers application to the Heritage Lottery Fund the principal reason for closing the golf course is the suggestion that it loses money and LBC subsidise the course.

We challenge this view as do the group set up by the Council the 'Beckenham Place Park Working Party' a long established forum for debate and discussion with stakeholders and Lewisham Council. Chaired by David Hansom they have been requesting the statistics on rounds played plus the financial income for the golf course broken down by type, including the ancillary revenues, since October 1st 2015. The Regeneration Officer (Gavin Plaskitt) despite agreeing to supply the data did not do so.

This information requested is commercially sensitive and confidential to Glendale Golf who are under no obligation to share the information with the Beckenham Place Park Working Party. Officers have provided information where they have been able to do so.

Officer Alison Taylor provided some data on 1st February after a request at the BPPWP on 21st January. The information supplied was out of date using price per round sterling figures from 2002/03. The information provided was misleading, it was provided this way to confuse. In the 'Future' report the data is equally misleading and we believe set out to be misleading and confusing.

Officers have attempted to present financial information as clearly as possible both to the BPPWP and in the report.

The use of 2002/03 figures in the response to Beckenham Place Park working party, in addition to more recent figures, was intended to illustrate the way in which income per round of golf played remained stable from 2002/03 to 2012/13.

The Mayor requested Kevin Sheehan 'Executive Director for Customer Services’ at LBC to respond to the questions raised in a letter sent to the
Mayor on 27th January concerning ‘false pretences’ of the HLF application on two counts.

1. The golf course loses money
2. The flawed consultation process at the first round of the Heritage Lottery Fund application and misrepresentation of the findings.

This section of the rebuttal deals with the claim that the golf course loses money, the matter of the flawed consultation has been dealt with earlier in this document.

In the absence of up to date information on the golf course revenue streams it attracts, presented in conventional accounting terms, we have put together a P&L. The numbers are based on information taken from Lewisham’s website and information included in the Officers documents.

The table below shows the detail of the revenue, the costs and lists the assumptions behind the P&L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBP Golf Course P&amp;L</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Notes/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green fees</strong></td>
<td>364,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ave 52/ @ £18/20 x 20,000 Rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golf Societies</strong></td>
<td>tba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancillary rev</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buggy &amp; Trolley hire</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20 buggies, £10 trolleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessories sales</strong></td>
<td>tba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catering (@ 50% margin)</strong></td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societies/matches</strong></td>
<td>tba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance staff costs</strong></td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>LBC cost*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance equipment &amp; materials</strong></td>
<td>42,310</td>
<td></td>
<td>LBC cost*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business rates</strong></td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>LBC cost*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glendale staff costs shop/catering</strong></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glendale cost**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glendale fee payment to LBC</strong></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glendale cost**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>457,000</td>
<td>429,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Margin/profit £27,690 -7%

*The costs are taken from the figures contained in the 'Future of Beckenham Place Park' report for the Mayor and Cabinet. Added to this, Alison Taylor confirmed at the Beckenham Place Park Working Party meeting on the 21st January, that the
maintenance costs included the wooded area on the western side of the railway, not just the golf course costs, which should not be forgotten.

** The Glendale staff costs are estimated for 4 staff plus one manager on site at the golf course with an allowance of 20% for social costs.

Please see table 2 within the report and note that the costs in this table relate specifically to the golf course and do not include any costs that do not directly relate to the golf operation. None of the staff costs have been provided by Glendale Golf

Assumptions to revenue numbers

1. The £364,000 green fees income is based on 20,000* rounds of golf at an average price of £18.20 allowing for the published Glendale prices.

2. The 2015/16 green fees are £27 for weekends and £20 for weekdays with concessions for seniors and juniors. We have allowed as best we can for the loyalty fee prices, but despite requesting that data it has not been forthcoming. The £364k could be an underestimate but until LBC provide the information in the detail requested this is the best interpretation we have.

3. In addition to the green fees we estimate buggy and trolley hire at £50,000 per annum with an average of six buggies per day at £20 cost and ten trolleys a day at £3 each.

4. Catering revenue is estimated at £43,000 operating at a 50% margin the sums could be greater.

5. We have made no allowance for income generated from Golf societies. Glendale will know what income the course has benefitted from in the past.

6. No revenue has been included for ancillary golf sales from golf products e.g. hats, golf gloves, balls etc. There will be some revenue and profit from these merchandise sales and Glendale will have a record of the income generated.

As stated at paragraph 5.4.16 of the Report, the income figure is not as high as the number of rounds of golf played may indicate for the reasons set out.

The assumptions in this profit and loss statement that do not match those contained within the main body of the Report have not been evidenced.

Based on the P&L the golf course is profitable and questions the Officers statement in the HLF application that the course loses money!

We are of the opinion that the reason the Officers expressed the view the golf course lost money and Lewisham subsidise the course was because of the 'Strange contract' (Gavin Plaskitt’s observation to the Sustainability Development Select Committee on 14th January). It is a strange contract
which allows Glendale to keep the largest proportion of the revenue generated by the course and pay a minimum fee to Lewisham. We estimate Glendale take gross revenue of £460,000 and pay a fee of £70,000 to Lewisham, we acknowledge Glendale fund the cost of staff to run the golf and the cafe at the Mansion and we have allowed for that in the P&L.

Lewisham pay the maintenance cost of the golf course advised to be £219,000. After allowing for a form of 'creative accounting' the Officers declare the course loses £149,000. That way they justified the loss in the application to the Heritage Lottery Fund.

Based on standard accounting methods the course even in its run–down state makes a profit of approx £30,000 around 7% margin, and could generate significantly more if it was marketed through inexpensive modern marketing techniques.

The financial position of the golf course is set out in detail at section 5.4 of the report.

It should be noted golf rounds have increased to 20,000 over the last two years from a base of 16,483 in 2013/14 that's an increase of 3,517 round or 21% over the last two years. With Golf returning to the Olympics this year and stabilisation in golf rounds across the UK according to the most recent research is this the time to close inner London's only 18 hole public course?

Appendix 5 of the report lists 18 golf courses which are within 30 minutes driving distance from Beckenham Place Park.

These are best estimates based on the data available, we urge the Mayor and the Councillors, given the core values of Lewisham Council, to provide the revenue details in a 'Open, honest and fair way' allowing consideration by stakeholders before proceeding to make a decision on closing the 100 year golf course that generates tangible revenue to the Park now.

The principal members of the Save the Beckenham 18 are not employed in the golf business or the green industry so allowing us to see the golfing stats in the way we have asked should not represent any problem for Glendale. We are prepared to sign confidentiality agreements if Glendale require lets please get the facts on the table?

As above, Glendale Golf is not obliged to share this information with any third party, because it is commercially sensitive.

Inadequate answers to key questions put to the Mayor by the Save the Beckenham 18 group

Questions put by the Save the Beckenham 18 group were sent to the Mayor from the Sustainability Development Select Committee. The Regeneration
Officers answers to those questions were included in Appendix 6, we ask you to please look at the questions contained in the appendix rather than us adding that text to this document.

Q1) Allowing for the fact the golf course has been proven to be profitable question one answers from the Officers are not relevant. We are aware from attendance at two of the latest consultation sessions in February, that when the Officers are asked about new revenue streams to replace golf it is very sketchy and no real indications and commitments are advised to have been agreed with third parties.

Q2) For the reasons explained the officers are not able to comment on future maintenance costs at this time. Given that information is not yet available, how can any coherent business case be made for closure of the golf course at present to be replaced by a new, uncosted, scheme?

At sections 5.4.3-5.4.22, officers provide full details of the current financial position of golf at Beckenham Place Park. The income figure above is based on assumptions which lack evidence.

5.4.25-5.4.30 sets out some of the potential future revenue streams.

The report sets out in full the rationale for the recommendation to close the golf course.

Detailed financial information is included within the report at sections 5.4.3-4.4.22 and officers do not recognise the figures presented in the Profit and Loss table within this Addendum. The assumptions about golf income in the table are not based on evidence.

Q3) The answers provided by the Officers to the question about the Glendale contract are in doubt, based on the belief the course is profitable if the P&L is addressed in a conventional way.

Detailed maintenance costs will be developed in parallel with the detailed design work and will form part of the HLF Stage 2 bid, should the Mayor decide to proceed with the recommendations contained within the report.

Q4) Whilst we understand the answers the Officers have given, the leap in faith required that new revenue streams will materialise and generate sufficient revenue is just that a ‘leap of faith’. With no firm commitments made beyond the running of a café, is it the right time to close a profitable golf course (which also generates café income) that could further improve its performance with some TLC.

Q5) In their response, Officers have completely side–stepped most of the issues, including the fact that the Heritage Lottery Fund case paper to its Trustees refers to a sporting programme in partnership with Greenwich
Tritons Triathlon Club. Does this mean that Heritage Lottery Fund’s Trustees have been misled?

Officers have not explained how the niche and expensive sport of Triathlon will be more accessible to local residents than public golf. Triathlon is not a free sport; it incurs costs in being a member of a club and having high specification equipment, clothing and accessories which cannot be hired.

Officers have not addressed the costs of maintenance of a lake to a high enough standard to accommodate the triathlon discipline of swimming, a sport they have quoted as wishing to provide in their Future of Beckenham Place Park paper to you and, indeed, has been advised to the Trustees of Heritage Lottery Fund.

It may be an aspiration to provide free sport (unlike, for example, charging for football pitches elsewhere in the borough) and therefore not accrue a revenue stream, but Officers have not explained how the costs to provide these activities will be addressed, including health and safety costs.

**Within the original HLF Bid, Greenwich Tritons Triathlon Club was named as one potential future user group. The HLF understands that the specific activities which are proposed within the Stage 1 bid are subject to change through the Development Stage prior to a Stage 2 bid submission.**

**The Stage 2 bid submission will include a 10 year Management and Maintenance Plan which will detail all the costs associated with the proposals and how these costs will be met.**

Q6) This question refers to the planned ‘events space’ in the West of the Park and the issue of viable access for equipment deliveries given the Mansion House has to be kept clear of vehicles in keeping with the 18 century setting.

The Officers answers have little substance and we would have thought that, given the two years they have been working on the plan, they could have adequately answered more of the questions.

**The HLF is expecting that the Stage 2 Bid Submission will be submitted in August, 6 months from now. The design team has consulted with Lewisham’s Event Managers who have provided comments on the masterplan which will be further developed over the next 6 months.**

Q7) The only straightforward answer, as far as it goes. However, as Mal Mitchell, Friends of Beckenham Place Park, has pointed out to Alison Taylor the main opportunities for on-the-ground environmental education are provided by the ancient woodlands and the natural river, neither of which are impacted by existence of the golf course. The presence of the golf course close to the proposed visitor hub is an excuse, not a valid reason to close the golf course.
Q8) This is a meaningless, unquantifiable, unsupported response.

Q9) The Officer response refers to developing a holistic plan. There is no holistic plan for the park. There is one scheme to change landscape in the west of the park and bring some buildings into use. There is another proposed scheme for the east of the park which has not yet been signed off (as at 26/1/16) by Environment Agency Chief Executive and partnership funding is yet to be secured. Then there will be a future application for the Mansion House.

Compare this to the Mansion House (and Homesteads as per the tender) having already been restored (or close to) via Beckenham Place Community Trust and the opportunities for funding applications to Heritage Lottery Fund to secure smaller grants for other improvements.

Conclusion

Allowing for the points presented in this rebuttal the fundamental issues for the Mayor, and the Councillors to decide on are two-fold. Firstly the profit and loss of the golf course and secondly the validity of consultation process and whether there is a mandate to close the golf course.

❖ The status of the P&L is in dispute; we ask that the financial figures are made available in a traditional standard accounting form in the spirit of the core values of Lewisham Council Open, honest and fair way.

❖ Don’t hide behind the Glendale contract. The principle individuals from Save the Beckenham 18 will sign confidentiality agreements if required by Glendale.

❖ The consultation process cannot be judged to be robust because the findings have been subject to a serious misrepresentation of the facts. These reasons alone should give a serious warning about using the results as they were wrongly included in the application to the Heritage Lottery Fund; there is no public mandate to close the golf course.

❖ We recommend to the Mayor and Cabinet to delay making a decision on the closure of the golf course until the facts are in the
public domain and the golf course financial figures have been prepared in the way requested.

- Secondly, we recommend further consultation is held in a structured and representative way to ensure the issues are properly put to the public, including all stakeholders. We would propose a professionally acknowledged market research company is engaged to carry out robust research that we will all agree to. We note the Heritage Lottery Fund have indicated that they expect Lewisham to carry out further consultation in respect of the possibility of closing the course.

All of the points summarised in the conclusion have been addressed by comments above
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1.0 Purpose of report

1.1 To update the Mayor on progress of the Surrey Canal Triangle (SCT) Regeneration by the developer, Renewal Group Limited, and the current land assembly position. For the purposes of this report, the developer is referred to throughout as “Renewal”. The Surrey Canal Triangle site is now known as ‘New Bermondsey’ and is referred to as such in this Report.

1.2 To seek the Mayor’s approval for the Council to use its compulsory purchase powers under Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to enable land assembly and acquisition of new rights so as to facilitate the comprehensive re-development of the New Bermondsey site (“the Site”) and in turn contribute to the wider regeneration of the Deptford/New Cross Area as supported by the Council’s Core Strategy and other applicable policy. The land and rights proposed to be acquired are described in Section 5 of this Report.

1.3 This Report further seeks the Mayor’s approval to the acquisition by the Council for planning purposes of Renewal’s freehold interest (both its existing freehold and any freehold interest that Renewal may subsequently acquire by private treaty) in Phases 1A, 1B, 2 and 3 of the Site and the grant of a lease of that land to Renewal with an option for Renewal to then repurchase the freehold. The purpose of this arrangement is to facilitate the comprehensive re-development of the Site by ensuring that third party rights do not impede the carrying out of the development. Further details are provided in Section 7 of this Report. Consequential upon this proposed arrangement, a variation to the existing CPO Indemnity Agreement is proposed which is also addressed in Section 7 of this Report.
1.4 A draft Statement of Reasons ("draft SoR") for making the proposed CPO is attached to this Report at Appendix 1. Although the Statement of Reasons is non-statutory, it is an important document and if the CPO is made, it will be served on owners, lessees/tenants and occupiers with the relevant statutory notices of making of the CPO. The draft SoR has been prepared in accordance with Government’s Guidance on Compulsory Purchase process published in October 2015 (CPO Guidance) which replaces the advice in Circular 06/04. Should the Mayor resolve to proceed with the CPO, the draft SoR will be finalised to reflect matters as at the time the Order is made and this is reflected in the delegation sought for the Executive Director of Resources and Regeneration.

1.5 This Report and the attached draft SoR describe the factors which are relevant to any decision on compulsory purchase, including the applicable planning policy framework for the Scheme, matters relevant to deliverability of the Scheme within a reasonable timeframe, its impact on affected land owners and occupiers and whether the proposals could be achieved by other means. It includes matters for the Mayor's consideration in relation to the Council's public sector equality duty and the implications for the Human Rights of third parties. It addresses the overall question of whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition.

1.6 References are made to the draft SoR throughout this Report, but Mayor and Cabinet are referred to the attached draft SoR generally and are asked to read that alongside the content of this Report.

2.0 Policy Context

2.1 The applicable Planning Policy framework for the Scheme is set out in Section 4 of the draft SoR and is discussed further below. Also relevant are the Council’s regeneration and community strategies, as well as its Corporate priorities and asset management policies.

2.2 ‘People, prosperity, place’, Lewisham’s regeneration strategy 2008-2020, sets out the Council's aspiration for a vibrant, dynamic Lewisham focussed around the themes of people - investing in the individuals and communities which are Lewisham’s greatest asset - prosperity - fostering the skills and economic opportunities for Lewisham to flourish and thrive - and place - developing high quality public spaces, sustainable buildings and protecting the areas which are sensitive to change. The strategy identifies the area as a strategic site with the Borough. The strategy is also placed within the framework of the key national and regional policies which affect the Council’s work around regeneration of the Borough, including the Mayor of London’s London Plan (2015).

2.3 'Shaping our future', Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 - 2020, includes the 'Dynamic and Prosperous' theme, where people are part of vibrant communities and town centres, well connected to London and beyond. It details the Local Strategic
Partnership's commitment to 'improving the quality and vitality of Lewisham's town centres and localities', and aspirations to 'support the growth and development of our town centres by working with commercial partners and developers', and 'maximise the use of our town centres as places to engage the local community'.

2.4 Shaping our future' identifies 'Active healthy citizens as a key priority – where the Council are committed to ensuring that people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being, supported by high quality health and care services, leisure, culture and recreational activities'.

2.5 Strengthening the local economy is a corporate priority, emphasising the importance of 'gaining resources to regenerate key localities, strengthen employment skills and promote public transport'.

2.6 The Council's Asset Management Plan sets out the approach to using property effectively in order to achieve the Council's objective of making Lewisham the best place in London to live, work and learn. It acknowledges that the Council's assets have a key role to play in supporting the Borough's regeneration aims.

2.7 The Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) sets the vision, objectives, strategy and policies that will guide development and regeneration in the Borough up to 2025. The Lewisham Core Strategy, the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan, the Lewisham Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, together with the Mayor of London’s London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) form the statutory development plan for the Borough.

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 The Mayor is recommended to:

(a) agree that, as set in this Report at Section 6, the pre-conditions for compulsory purchase set by Mayor & Cabinet on 7 March 2012 have been met.

(b) resolve to make a Compulsory Purchase Order pursuant to powers under Sections 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (in accordance with the procedures in the Acquisition of Land Act 1981) for:

i) the acquisition of the land shown coloured pink on the plan attached to the Internet version of this report at Appendix 2, save for the interests of the Council, Renewal and persons with the benefit of rights of light; and

ii) the acquisition of new rights over the land shown coloured blue on the plan attached to the Internet version of this report at Appendix 2


for the purpose of facilitating the comprehensive redevelopment, development and improvement of the Site to provide a mixed use residential-led scheme.

(c) grant delegated authority to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration in consultation with the Head of Law:

i) subject to a satisfactory Deposit or satisfactory alternative security being provided by Renewal pursuant to the CPO Indemnity Agreement dated 20 December 2013, to take all necessary and appropriate steps to secure the making, confirmation and implementation of the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) including the publication and service of all notices and promotion of the Council’s case at any Public Inquiry, including but not limited to the steps described below;

ii) to carry out any further or additional land referencing as may be considered appropriate, including service or requisitions for information pursuant to Section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 or Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;

iii) to make any amendments, deletions, or additions to the draft Order Map and/or draft Schedules to the CPO so as to include and describe all interests in land and rights required to facilitate the carrying out of the Scheme;

iv) to make such changes as may be considered necessary or appropriate to the draft Statement of Reasons prior to publication;

v) to acquire interests and new rights in the Order Land either by agreement or compulsorily (including pursuant to any blight or purchase notices) and dispose of the same to Renewal

vi) to negotiate, agree terms and enter into agreement with interested parties, including agreements for the withdrawal of blight or purchase notices and/or objections to the CPO and/or undertakings not to enforce the CPO on specified terms, including where appropriate seeking the exclusion of land or rights from the CPO;
vii) in the event that the Secretary of State notifies the Council that it has been given the power to confirm the CPO to confirm the CPO if the Executive Director is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so;

viii) in the event the CPO is confirmed by the Secretary of State (or by the Council if given power to do so), to complete all necessary statutory procedures and to take steps to implement the CPO, including by way of General Vesting Declaration and/or Notice to Treat/Notice of Entry;

ix) to take all steps in relation to any legal proceedings relating to the CPO, including defending or settling claims referred to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) and/or applications made to the courts and any appeals;

x) to retain and/or appoint external professional advisers and consultants to assist in facilitating the promotion, confirmation and implementation of the CPO, the settlement of compensation and any other claims or disputes;

xi) to take all such other steps as may be considered necessary or appropriate to acquire all interests and rights required for the Scheme (whether by agreement or CPO) and to dispose of the same to Renewal.

(d) agree the acquisition by the Council for planning purposes pursuant to Section 227 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 of Renewal’s freehold interest (both its existing freehold and any freehold interest that Renewal may subsequently acquire by private treaty) in land within Phases 1A, 1B, 2 and 3 as shown coloured grey on the plan attached to Internet version of this report at Appendix 3 and the grant of a lease of that land to Renewal (with an option for Renewal to repurchase the freehold interest) on the terms set out in the Heads of Terms attached to this report at Appendix 4, including any variation thereto as the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration, in consultation with the Head of Law, may consider appropriate;

(e) agree the variation of the CPO Indemnity Agreement of 20th December 2013 to ensure the agreement provides for the Council to be indemnified by Renewal in respect of all compensation and other costs arising in respect of any interference with rights affecting the land acquired by the Council and leased back to Renewal as provided for in recommendation (d) above.

4.0 Background

4.1 For over 10 years now, Renewal has been assembling the Site with a view to its re-development. Renewal promoted the Site through the
In January 2011, Renewal (through its subsidiary, Renewal New Bermondsey Two Limited) submitted an application for planning permission for comprehensive mixed use residential led re-development of the Site.

In March 2012, a report was presented to Mayor and Cabinet regarding in principle support for the use of CPO powers to assist with land assembly for the Scheme. The Mayor resolved in principle to use such powers, subject to certain pre-conditions being satisfied which are addressed in this Report.

On 30 March 2012, the Council granted outline planning permission (Outline Planning Permission) for the comprehensive phased, mixed-use development of the Site. The Outline Planning Permission permits the development of the Site based upon a set of planning parameters that would enable detailed proposals to come forward for the following:

The comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of the site for up to 240,000 square metres (Gross External Area) of development comprising Class A1/A2 (Shops and Financial and Professional Services) up to 3,000 square metres, Class A3/A4 (Cafes/Restaurants and Drinking Establishments) up to 3,000 square metres, Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) up to 300 square metres, Class B1 (Business) between 10,000 - 15,000 square metres, Class C1 (Hotels) up to 10,000 square metres, Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) between 150,000 - 190,000 square metres (up to 2,400 homes of different sizes and types), Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions) between 400 - 10,000 square metres, Class D2 (Leisure and Assembly) between 4,260 - 15,800 square metres, involving the demolition of all existing buildings on the site with the exception of the Millwall FC Stadium (which is to be retained and its façade upgraded and/or re-clad), Plot Excelsior 2 – Guild House (which is to be retained and extended), and Plot Excelsior 5 – Rollins House (which is to be retained, but not altered or extended as part of the planning application); the demolition and replacement of the existing Millwall FC grounds-person’s store of approximately 140 sqm; redevelopment to provide a series of new buildings (including rooftop and basement plant); re-profiling of site levels; alterations to Surrey Canal road and the re-alignment of the Bolina Road; new streets and other means of access and circulation, including pedestrian/cycle paths, carriageways and servicing areas; areas for parking for emergency services vehicles and outside broadcast units; external areas of land and soft landscaping and publicly accessible open space; car and coach parking areas and accesses to them; cycle storage; and, supporting infrastructure works and facilities including sub-stations, energy centre(s), District Heating Network (DHN) connections to and between each plot, the proposed energy centre and the adjoining South East London Combined Heat and Power (SELCHP) plant (to the extent to which they lie within the Planning Application Boundary) and an ENVAC waste storage and handling system (including DNH and
ENVAC connections to plots south of Surrey Canal Road under the carriageway of Surrey Canal Road, as altered). Further details of the March 2012 outline consent are contained within Section 4 of the draft SoR.

4.5 The Outline Planning Permission was also subject to a Section 106 Agreement entered into on the same date and making provision as follows:

- The ability to increase the crowd capacity of The Den to increase from 20,148 to 26,500 should Millwall Football Club secure promotion to the Premier League and require a larger stadium.
- Re-cladding of the MFC stadium
- Provision of car parking spaces to be used by MFC both on event and non-event days
- Relocation of Millwall FC memorial garden and grounds keeps store
- Relocation of Millwall Community Scheme to a replacement facility
- Re-provision of coach parking spaces to be used by MFC on event days
- An increase sustainable accessibility to the Stadium by providing the proposed pedestrian link to South Bermondsey Station,
- Facilitation of the provision of a new Surrey Canal Road Station
- Improved connectivity with the surrounding area for pedestrians and cyclists
- Provision of new bus terminus
- Delivery of new sports facilities
- Delivery of a multi faith centre
- Provision of not less than 12% affordable housing (by habitable room)
- Entering into of a CPO Indemnity Agreement with the Council
- Contribution towards the provision of additional school places in the area
- Contribution to improvements to Bridge House Meadows
- Provision of a creative industries hub
- Installation of ENVAC waste system

4.6 In October 2013, Renewal submitted an application pursuant to Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary conditions on the Outline Planning Permission to reconfigure some of the uses within the Scheme, but the overall quantum of floorspace across the Site as a whole remained the same and the Section 73 application did not fundamentally change the nature or scale of the previously consented development. The revised proposals include providing the bulk of the sports facilities in a single building on Timber Wharf (Phase 2).
4.7 On the 18 December 2015, the Council granted permission pursuant to the Section 73 application (S73 Permission). The S73 Permission is subject to a Section 106 Agreement which was completed on the same date and which includes (with appropriate variations) similar obligations to those contained in the S106 Agreement of 2012 and applies those obligations to the development under the S73 Permission.

4.8 On 20 December 2013, the Council entered into a conditional land sale agreement with Renewal relating to the disposal of the Council’s freehold interest in the land leased to Millwall Football Club (MFC) (excluding the stadium itself) and in the Lion’s Centre, the latter being leased to Millwall Community Scheme (MCS). Further details of the agreement are provided below. On the same date, the Council entered into a CPO Indemnity Agreement which addresses the land assembly required for the Scheme and provides for Renewal to cover the costs of the process (including by way of CPO, should the Council decide to exercise its powers – it is under no obligation to do so).

4.9 Within the boundary of the land encompassed by the Outline Planning Permission and the S73 Permission is a property known as Rollins House. ‘Rollins House’ includes Rollins House itself and Unit 12 Excelsior Works. Both planning permissions refer to Rollins House being retained unaltered. In July 2014, Renewal submitted an application to redevelop the Rollins House site as part of the wider Scheme. A decision on that application was deferred by Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) in November 2014 and July 2015. At its meeting in September 2015, SPC resolved that the application again be deferred for the applicant to look at a revisions which ensure that Rollins House is retained and preserved within a redesigned mixed use scheme and for the applicant (Renewal) to hold further discussions with the current occupiers of Rollins House and secure the re-provision of creative uses within the redesigned scheme. The application remains in abeyance and the land forming the Rollins House site does not form part of this Report.

Scheme progress since March 2012

4.10 Following the grant of the Outline Planning Permission, in addition to continuing its efforts to assemble the Site, Renewal has focused on securing occupiers for the commercial spaces in the first three phases of development - Phases 1A, 2 and 1B.

(a) Phase 1A: Hillsong church is currently in detailed discussions with Renewal over the terms for delivery and occupation of the permanent faith building within this phase. As part of their commitment to being in the Scheme, in 2013 Hillsong created a 3,000 sq m temporary home in a warehouse on the Site at Stockholm Road and have established a 2,500-person weekly congregation amongst the local community. Subject to concluding the necessary Development Agreement with Hillsong, detailed planning permission being granted and completion of the necessary land assembly, it is envisaged that
works for the permanent faith building will commence on-site in quarter 4 2017 with a two-year build period. This timetable is contingent on the remaining land being acquired by agreement or CPO.

(b) Phase 2: The re-development proposals include a 15,000 sq m sports facility, called Energize, which will be the largest indoor community multi sports complex in London since Crystal Palace was built in the 1960s. The Surrey Canal Sports Foundation Ltd (SCSF) was established in 2010 as a charitable trust, independent of the Renewal, to oversee the fund raising of the required £40m for delivery of Energize and to ensure its long-term availability to the community at local authority rates.

So far the SCSF has received a pledge of the land from Renewal, valued at £10 million, along with in principle pledges of £2m from Sport England and £500,000 from the Council. In July 2014, the SCSF formed a partnership with OnSide, a charity which has created a network of youth centres primarily in northwest England at a cost of £5 - £6 million each. OnSide is seeking to open several Youth Zones in London and would like to incorporate a Youth Zone within the fabric of Energize. The SCSF is also in the early stages of similar discussions with Greenhouse Sports who provide sports coaching in deprived areas, with a view to them having a permanent home in Energize. Both of these organisations would make capital contributions to the building and whilst the amount of space they require is still being finalised, their involvement would bring the pledges for Energize up to the region of £23.5m. Once confirmed, this amount would be enough to trigger detailed designs for the building and a reserved matters planning application, which in turn would aid the fundraising of the remaining capital.

In order to facilitate sport in the local community today, in 2013 the SCSF leased 2,200 sq m on-site at Stockholm Road to London Thunder Basketball and Fusion Table Tennis Clubs in which they have created a new home complete with two basketball courts, 16 table tennis tables, changing and classroom space and spectator seating. Renewal advise that this sports facility currently attracts c. 2,800 people a month. It is envisaged that works for Phase 2 will commence on-site in quarter 4 2017 with a two-year build period.

(c) Phase 1B: As at the date of publication of this Report there are 6 interests to be acquired within this phase (see Section 5 below). With its close proximity to the new Overground station which will allow quick travel times between the creative hubs around Old Street and Shoreditch, Phase 1B is proposed for a mix of creative industries centred around a significant public square. As with the other phases, Renewal is looking for an established occupier to operate this phase and preliminary discussions have
commenced with a number of established creative organisations. Renewal remains confident of securing a significant creative business to this phase once New Bermondsey station is formally announced by Transport for London.

4.11 On 20th February 2015, the Mayor of London and the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that the Site had been designated as one of the first of the Mayor of London’s Housing Zones. Housing Zone status has been awarded to areas identified as key opportunity sites, to maximise development, fast track homes and deliver much-needed infrastructure to boost development. As one of the first Housing Zones, the Site is recognised as a key development in London and is one of the few regeneration projects that has the capacity to deliver homes for Londoners, faster.

4.12 Housing Zone designation will provide £20 million of loan funding towards infrastructure, funded by the GLA and the Treasury. An agreement for the loan facility is due to be completed between Renewal and the GLA shortly. This loan funding will facilitate the delivery of key infrastructure, including the new Overground Station along with two new bus routes and improvements to existing walking and cycling routes. Delivery of these transport links will provide significant benefit for the 40,000 people already living within a 15-minute walk of the Site and will allow development of the first two phases of the Scheme (Phases 1A and 2) to proceed ahead of schedule delivering 532 homes. A programme of regular monitoring meetings will be agreed between the GLA, Renewal and the Council to enable accelerated delivery.

5.0 Land and rights to be included in the Compulsory Purchase Order

5.1 The boundary of the proposed Order Land is shown outlined red on the plan attached to this Report at Appendix 2 (CPO Resolution Plan), with the land to be acquired shaded pink and the land in respect of which new rights are to be acquired shaded blue.

5.2 It should be noted that whilst much of the Site is shaded pink on the CPO Resolution Plan, this area includes interests already held/controlled by Renewal and the Council and the CPO would not include those interests. It would also exclude any rights of light which it is proposed should be addressed in the manner set out in Section 7 of this Report.

5.3 The land already owned/controlled by Renewal is identified on the plan attached to this Report at Appendix 5. The Council owns the freehold interest in the Millwall FC Stadium and the Lion’s Centre which is leased to MCS, together with other small surplus areas of land transferred back to the Council by Rail for London following completion of the East London Line extension. The land around the Stadium, MCS’s interest and the RfL surplus areas are subject to the conditional Land Sale Agreement entered into between the Council and Renewal.
in December 2013 providing for disposal to Renewal of the Council’s freehold interest.

5.4 The freehold and leasehold interests proposed to be included in the CPO are listed in the Table attached to this Report at Appendix 6. Column 2 within the Table includes a plan reference and the relevant plans are included within Appendix 6. Also included within Appendix 6 is a plan identifying the third party interest to be acquired. As indicated in the Table at Appendix 6, as at 4 February 2016 24 freehold and leasehold interests (excluding highways plots) remain to be acquired. In addition, the following are proposed to be included in the Order:

(a) mines and minerals which have been reserved out of titles where the areas concerned are likely to be impacted by piling/foundations required for the Scheme;
(b) highways plots (sub-soil interests)
(c) four substations that are on land to be redeveloped, plus existing rights of statutory undertakers with service connections within the Site which are likely to require removal or relocation to facilitate the Scheme. The existing services are shown on the Utility Services plan attached to this Report at Appendix 7;
(d) existing rights of way in favour of Network Rail providing access to railway embankments etc and which are likely to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.5 New rights are also required to fulfil certain requirements of the Section 106 Agreement. These affect land owned by Network Rail, London Underground Limited and MFC. The rights include in summary (and subject to detailed drafting):

(a) The right to construct, use (in common with others) and maintain a pedestrian and cycle access route from the north west corner of the Site to South Bermondsey Railway Station.
(b) The right to carry out works to upgrade railway arches and underpasses at South Bermondsey Station, Zampa Road, Stockholm Road, Rollins Street, Bolina Road and the route to Surrey Quays and thereafter maintain the works.
(c) The right to carry out works to landscape and thereafter maintain railway embankments adjoining the Site and to carry out habitat creation works on the said land.
(d) The right to install and maintain conducting media under the railway arch between the South East London Combined Heat and Power facility and the Site to the extent it is required for the installation of the proposed district heating network that is to provide heat and power to the Scheme.
(e) The right to carrying out and complete works to replace and improve the existing façade of the MFC Stadium, as required by
the Section 106 Agreement relating to the outline planning permission (and as to be applied to the Section 73 consent).

5.6 The position regarding negotiations with landowners is considered in more detail in Section 6 of this Report. Renewal will continue, with the support of the Council, to seek to acquire the outstanding interests by agreement. Council officers have also written a number of times to the remaining landowners encouraging them to engage with Renewal and offering to engage directly with the landowners, should they be unwilling for any reason to deal with Renewal. The most recent letter was sent to landowners by the Council on 11 December 2015, with a further letter being sent on 19 January 2016 notifying owners of the intention to present this Report to Mayor and Cabinet. The Council and Renewal have received 9 responses in total following these letters; 4 from Phase 1B (Excelsior), 3 from Phase 5 (Bolina), 1 from MCS and 1 from MFC. Renewal, the Council or G L Hearn, as appropriate, are following up on each of these responses and further discussions/negotiations are ongoing.

5.7 If the CPO is made, it will include a Schedule of the interests, including new rights, to be acquired, as well as those who have interests over the land to be acquired (e.g. rights of way etc) which may be affected by the development works. The Order Map required to accompany the CPO will identify the land and new rights to be acquired. Terraquest, experienced land-referencing agents, have been appointed by Renewal to carry out the necessary referencing and preparation of the CPO Map. Further requisitions for information relating to ownership will be served as necessary before the Order Map and Schedule are finalised. Final versions of the Map and Schedule will be published with the CPO when made.

5.8 If the CPO resolution is made, this will be recorded in the Local Land Charges Register and disclosed on searches so that any potential purchasers will be aware that the land is subject to compulsory purchase.

6.0 Pre-conditions to CPO Resolution

6.1 As already referred to, on the 7th March 2012, the Mayor resolved ‘in principle’ to use CPO powers to support the land assembly required for the Scheme, subject to the following pre-conditions:

i) the Mayor being satisfied that Renewal has used its reasonable endeavours to complete the assembly of the Site by agreement/private treaty and that the redevelopment proposals cannot otherwise be delivered;

ii) the requirements of Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 and Sections 226, and 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 being met;
iii) the Mayor being satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest to make a Compulsory Purchase Order;

iv) the Mayor being satisfied that there is a delivery mechanism with Renewal and/or others in place, which ensures that there is a comprehensive redevelopment of the whole Site and that the new development will be built and completed within a reasonable time period;

v) the Mayor being satisfied that Renewal has a viable business plan and funding strategy to deliver a comprehensive regeneration scheme, together with a full and sufficient indemnity agreement(s) and appropriate financial bond covering the costs of making and confirming any such CPO/appropriation for the purposes of Section 237; and

vi) consideration of any issues raised by the Equalities Impact Assessment on the potential impact of the Compulsory Purchase Order.

6.2 Officers consider that these pre-conditions have now been met, as discussed below under the relevant headings.

(i) Negotiations with landowners

6.3 GL Hearn have been jointly appointed by the Council and Renewal as CPO valuers to advise on property cost estimates for the compulsory acquisition of interests and to negotiate settlements with landowners and others with an interest in the proposed Order Land.

6.4 Renewal owns a significant proportion of the Site required for the Scheme, having actively been acquiring property by private treaty since 2004. There are 24 interests (excluding highways plots) in land outside of Renewal’s ownership (or control if not formally conveyed) which are required in order to complete land assembly to bring forward the Scheme in its entirety. These interests comprise mainly freehold or long leasehold interests in the industrial estates within the Site. Additionally, new rights will be required as set out in paragraph 5.5.

6.5 Renewal has provided the Council with details of the extent of and current position on negotiations with landowners, together with copies of material correspondence, undertaken by both Renewal and GL Hearn. Council officers have examined the material provided and are satisfied that Renewal has used reasonable endeavours over a substantial period to acquire the outstanding interests by negotiation. It is continuing and will continue to try and move those negotiations forward. Renewal has also submitted a relocation strategy which has been approved by the Council under the Section 106 requirements setting out its intentions with regard to continued occupation of the Site by tenants until possession is required and steps taken regarding assistance with relocation. A copy of the relocation strategy is included at Appendix J to the draft SoR.
6.6 In negotiations with the landowners, Renewal has also provided contact details for Council officers and encouraged landowners to contact the Council if they would prefer to deal with the Council, rather than Renewal. The Council has also written to the outstanding owners encouraging them to negotiate with Renewal and offering to treat with them and to provide formal valuations if they are unable or unwilling to reach agreement with Renewal. The most recent letters were sent to remaining owners on 11 December 2015 and also on 19 January 2016 notifying them of the intention to present this Report to Mayor and Cabinet. Notwithstanding the efforts made, however, attempts hitherto to acquire all the outstanding interests by agreement have not been successful.

6.7 Good progress has been made with negotiations with some of the remaining landowners. In relation to Network Rail, agreement has been reached in principle and Renewal is confident a formal agreement will be concluded in due course. In respect of Bridge House, terms have been agreed for a disposal to Renewal, subject to contract. In a number of cases, however, negotiations have stalled with landowners unwilling to negotiate until the Council has made a decision regarding compulsory acquisition.

6.8 The largest remaining interests by area yet to be acquired are those vested in MFC and MCS. With regard to MFC, discussions have taken place over a number of years in relation to the acquisition of MFC’s leasehold interest in the land around the Stadium. Renewal has also submitted a formal offer to MFC for that interest, but MFC remain unwilling to negotiate any agreement for the surrender of their leasehold interest. MFC maintain (a position confirmed in MFC’s recent response to the Council’s letter of 19 January 2016 and subsequent meetings) that they wish to redevelop the land around the Stadium themselves in a manner consistent with Renewal’s proposals. Despite being given ample opportunity to do so, however, they have not submitted any planning application, nor otherwise produced any detailed proposals. Nor (despite being advised to do so) have they provided a business case and funding strategy which demonstrates how any such proposals can be carried out in a manner which fits in with and does not prejudice the wider Scheme, including from a viability perspective.

6.9 MFC have provided information regarding the rights they will require over the land around the Stadium in the event the land is acquired by CPO and discussions have taken place over the grant of those rights. Continued attempts will be made to negotiate with MFC to reach agreement in respect of the rights required and also the disposal of MFC’s leasehold interest in the land around the Stadium to Renewal or the Council.

6.10 With regard to MCS’s interest, the Council and Renewal have engaged in detailed negotiations with MCS regarding the Heads of Terms for the surrender of their leasehold interest in the Lion’s Centre and
subsequent relocation to the new sports facilities (Energize) within Phase 2 of the Scheme. This engagement has taken the form of a series of meetings between the Council, Renewal and a representative from the MCS Board of Trustees to discuss surrender of lease by the MCS and their relocation to Energize. The Council has also agreed to fund legal advice to enable MCS to conclude negotiations. Agreement was reached on Heads of Terms, subject to agreement on the compensation sum and the final terms of the new lease and relocation of the Lion’s Centre. In June 2015, however, MCS rejected the terms of the proposed transaction and the compensation sum offered by Renewal and negotiations stalled. Following the Council’s letter of 19 January 2016, however, discussions have resumed with MCS.

6.11 Making a CPO will not mean that attempts to acquire by agreement will cease. The CPO Guidance makes clear that compulsory purchase is intended as a last resort in the event that efforts to acquire by agreement fail. However, the CPO Guidance also recognises that valuable time might be lost if an authority waits until negotiations do fail before making a CPO. Authorities are advised that it may often be sensible to plan a compulsory purchase timetable as a contingency measure and initiate formal procedures. The CPO Guidance notes that this will also help to make the seriousness of the authority’s intentions clear which might in turn encourage those affected to enter more readily into meaningful negotiations. Any interests acquired by private treaty will not be included in the CPO or (where acquisition is achieved after the CPO is made) a request made that the CPO be not confirmed in respect of such interest, as appropriate.

6.12 The Site is allocated as a strategic site within the Council’s Core Strategy. A key requirement of the Core Strategy is that the Site is brought forward for comprehensive development in accordance with a Masterplan. The purpose for which land and rights are proposed to be acquired is to enable comprehensive redevelopment of the Order Land in accordance with the adopted planning policy framework. The Outline Planning Permission and the S73 Permissions envisage comprehensive redevelopment in accordance with those policies.

6.13 Officers have considered whether redevelopment in accordance with the planning policy objectives might be achieved by individual landowners without the need for compulsory purchase, including whether that could be achieved within a reasonable timeframe. Given that they own or control the majority of the interests in the Site, Renewal is the obvious partner to bring forward the Scheme. It is considered that separate development of other parcels would be likely to result in piecemeal development, risk the non-achievement of comprehensive development of the Site and risk substantial delays in the Scheme coming forward. Not only would it require a significant degree of co-operation between current owners which to date there has not been, but also there are no alternative, credible development proposals currently proposed or likely to be capable of coming forward and implemented within a reasonable timescale.
6.14 The Site is unique in terms of size, scale and location of development. The Site is almost assembled, ready for implementation. Officers consider the planning objectives cannot be achieved from pursuing any alternative site for this scale of major regeneration. There is no comparable area available for this scale of development, even if the Council had the resources to assemble a similar site in a reasonable timescale.

6.15 Given the anticipated development programme, officers consider that formal CPO procedures should now commence to ensure delivery of the necessary land assembly. Negotiations will continue in parallel with the CPO process and every effort will be made to try and conclude the remaining acquisitions by agreement ahead of confirmation of the CPO.

Officers consider pre-condition (i) has been met.

(ii) Statutory powers, CPO Guidance

6.16 Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 \(\text{1990 Act}\) empowers the Council, on being authorised by the Secretary of State, to acquire compulsorily land in its area if it thinks that the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement on or in relation to the land. The Council must not, however, use this power unless it also thinks that the development, redevelopment or improvement is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following objects:

(a) the promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of the Council's area;
(b) the promotion or improvement of the social well-being of the Council's area;
(c) the promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of the Council's area.

(Section 226(1A) of the 1990 Act).

6.17 The Mayor is directed to Section 3 of the draft SoR which sets out how the proposed compulsory acquisition is considered to fall within the provisions of Section 226 and delivers the well-being objectives required by Section 226(1A).

6.18 In some circumstances, only new rights over land might be required, such as a new right of access etc. This being the case, it is usually not necessary to acquire the freehold or leasehold interest. Instead, section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 enables the Council, subject to authorisation by the Secretary of State, to create and acquire new rights over land. That is proposed here where only a right is required and not the entire land interest, the new rights proposed being referred to in paragraph 5.5 of this Report.
Section 227 of the 1990 Act provides an equivalent power for the Council to acquire land (including rights over land) by agreement (as opposed to compulsorily) for the purposes described in paragraph 6.16. As set out in this Report and as is reflected in the CPO Guidance, it is intended that efforts to acquire the necessary land and rights by agreement will continue in tandem with the CPO process.

As indicated above, the Council and Renewal has entered into a CPO indemnity Agreement which governs the process of land assembly. The Council has power under Section 233 of the 1990 Act, subject to the requirements of that Section, to dispose of any land acquired for planning purposes. It is intended that land acquired pursuant to the terms of the CPO Indemnity Agreement will be disposed of to Renewal pursuant to Section 233.

Upon completion of any compulsory acquisition, Section 236 of the 1990 Act provides for any rights of way or rights to apparatus are automatically extinguished (save those of statutory undertakers etc which are subject to separate procedures). In addition, where land is acquired or appropriated by a local authority for planning purposes (whether by CPO or private treaty). Section 237 of the 1990 Act makes provision for certain third party rights to be overridden when the land is developed in accordance with planning permission. Development and use of such land in accordance with planning permission, either by the local authority or by a person deriving title under the authority, will be authorised, even though it interferes with a third party right, such as an easement, or it breaches a restrictive covenant on the use of the land. Any third party whose rights are overridden in consequence of Section 237 is entitled to statutory compensation, assessed in accordance with provisions in Section 237 regarding compensation.

In terms of the Stadium land, it is proposed that the CPO includes the acquisition of MFC’s leasehold interest in the land surrounding the Stadium and also new rights over the Stadium land to enable the carrying out of the works to the Stadium façade. The Council will retain the freehold interest in the Stadium itself. The freehold interest in the land around the Stadium is subject to the Land Sale Agreement entered into with Renewal in December 2013.

Ofﬁcers consider pre-condition (ii) has been met.

(iii) Compelling case in the public interest

The relevant considerations for the purposes of any resolution to use compulsory purchase powers are set out in this Report and the attached draft SoR. The CPO Guidance also sets out the considerations to be applied when making a resolution to exercise such powers and the factors which will weigh with the Secretary of State when deciding whether to confirm a CPO. These factors include what might be described as the overarching consideration as follows:
“A compulsory purchase Order should only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest. An acquiring authority should be sure that the purposes for which the compulsory purchase order is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. Particular consideration should be given to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights and, in the case of a dwelling, Article 8 of the Convention.”

6.24 Human Rights considerations are addressed in Section 11 of the draft SoR and in Section 11 of this Report.

6.25 In addition, the following considerations are material by virtue of the CPO Guidance. These aspects are discussed elsewhere in this Report and the draft SoR:

- whether the purpose for which the land is being acquired fits in with the adopted planning framework for the area. In addition to this specific requirement, the general requirements of the CPO Guidance states that any programme of land assembly must be set within a clear strategic framework and that such framework will need to be founded on an appropriate evidence base and to have been subject to consultation processes including those whose property is directly affected (see Section 10 of this Report and Section 4 of the draft SoR);

- the extent to which the proposed purpose of acquisition would contribute to the achievement of the promotion and/or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the Council's area (see Section 3 of the draft SoR);

- that the necessary resources, including funding, are likely to be available to achieve the purpose of the Order within a reasonable timescale (see paragraphs 6.41 to 6.49 of this Report and Section 6 of the draft SoR);

- that the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by physical or legal impediments (see Sections 6 and 7 of this Report and Section 6 of the draft SoR);

- whether the purposes for which the proposed Order Land is to be acquired could be achieved by any other means. This can include considering the appropriateness of any alternative proposals put forward by the owners of the land or others, or examining the suitability of alternative locations for the purpose for which the land is being acquired (see paragraphs 6.13 and 6.14 of this Report and Section 6 of the draft SoR).

6.26 Mayor and Cabinet are referred to Section 9 of the draft SoR which brings together the various aspects of the CPO case. Social benefits will be provided from the delivery of sustainably constructed new homes
that will make a significant contribution to meeting private and affordable housing need in the Borough, as well as new community and leisure facilities. The concentration of development will be better able to access new and existing public transport. By land assembly, rationalising, improving and providing new uses and infrastructure on the Site, there will be significant environmental benefits. The Scheme will give rise to economic benefits in terms of major investment in the Borough, with jobs created from construction, new commercial, community and leisure uses. The new resident and business population will contribute to the local economy. Further details of the compelling case in the public interest are set out in the draft SoR. Officers are satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the use of CPO powers.

6.27 Officers consider pre-condition (iii) has been met.

(iv) Viability/delivery mechanism

6.28 The CPO Guidance makes clear that if a CPO is to be confirmed, there must be a compelling case in the public interest and the purpose for which the CPO is made must justify interfering with the human rights of those affected. If the acquiring authority is unable to show how the CPO land is to be used and that the necessary resources are likely to be available to achieve the purpose of acquisition within a reasonable timescale, it is unlikely to be able to show the acquisition is justified in the public interest. When preparing its justification, the acquiring authority further needs to show the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any physical or legal impediments to implementation. The acquiring authority is also required to provide substantive information regarding sources of funding, including as to how potential shortfalls may be met if funding has not yet been finalised.

6.29 The Site is one of five strategic sites identified within, and considered key to, the delivery of the Council’s Core Strategy. The Core Strategy sets out the ambition to transform the physical environment and achieve place-making objectives by delivering a comprehensive range of regeneration outcomes in the Borough. In conjunction with the Council, Renewal has spent more than 10 years shaping and facilitating the comprehensive regeneration of the Site. During this time Renewal has acquired by private treaty the vast majority of property interests required to assemble the Site and has secured the Outline Planning Permission and S73 Permission for the scheme which will deliver significant and comprehensive regeneration to this deprived area. In doing so, Renewal has incurred significant capital expenditure in acquisition, design, planning and consultants’/advisors’ costs. There can be little doubt that Renewal has made a significant financial commitment and has demonstrated a long term outlook and how serious it is about ensuring that this comprehensive scheme is brought forward.

6.30 That of itself this is not enough, however, and the Council needs to be satisfied that if it proceeds with a CPO to assemble the remaining interests, the necessary resources are likely to be in place to achieve
the purpose of the acquisition within a reasonable timescale. As such, it needs to be satisfied the scheme is viable, deliverable and fundable.

6.31 To that end, the Council has asked Renewal to provide detailed information regarding deliverability of the Scheme, including as to viability and the funding strategy. Renewal appointed GL Hearn (a leading property consultant) to bring this detail together in a single report. The Council in turn appointed PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP (PWC) to provide financial and real estate due diligence and to review the GL Hearn report and additional information provided by Renewal/GL Hearn. PwC’s key conclusions/consideration, which Officers accept, are set out below.

6.32 GL Hearn have developed detailed, bottom up, appraisals using industry standard software to assess the viability and deliverability of Renewal’s intended delivery strategy using current planning permission and market cost and revenue assumptions. PwC consider those cost and revenue inputs to be reasonable and supported by market benchmarks. Furthermore, following a review of the outputs and funding assumptions made PWC conclude that Renewal’s intended delivery strategy is appropriate and that the development would be viable and therefore have a reasonable chance of being delivered in line with Renewal’s proposals.

6.33 Renewal has established that the most appropriate strategy for delivering the comprehensive redevelopment is a Master Developer Strategy (MDS). Under the MDS, Renewal will dispose of (by way of development agreements with house builders) individual development plots/phases in an ordered manner over the development period. From this Renewal will retain the residual land value from the sale and, wherever possible, retain the commercial interests in any sub-development to drive long-term revenue to the organisation. There is strong developer demand for residential development opportunities in this part of London, particularly of the size of development that each phase represents and the price point of the residential units.

6.34 Under the proposed strategy, Renewal will maintain responsibility for the delivery of the Community Sports Facility (Energize) in Phase 2, the new Overground station, transport interchange and the urban/public realm. In addition, Renewal will retain design control across the whole development and retain the commercial property in each phase.

6.35 The MDS approach will allow Renewal to offset much of the delivery risk but at the same time retain overall control to ensure that a comprehensive scheme and quality shared places/public realm can be delivered. All are important public benefits that underpin the case for the CPO and facilitate the much-needed housing and policy ambition for comprehensive redevelopment in the area.

6.36 PWC have confirmed that a MDS approach is a recognised commercial approach for large, complex, multifaceted schemes. There are a number of examples of this delivery route being employed elsewhere,
including the Olympic Park in Stratford. PWC also note that the transfer of construction and residential market risk to a specialist sub-developer helps to dissipate the risk of delivery for large regeneration schemes.

6.37 As noted above, the GL Hearn appraisal model uses current market assumptions about a range of variable factors. These include the cost of finance and the attractiveness of the MDS approach and potential returns. Within their appraisal, GL Hearn set out their assumptions regarding the absorption rate of residential sales into the market place, build costs and sales receipts. Renewal/GL Hearn have appointed DBK (a recognised project management, cost management and building consultancy with experience of large scale developments) to provide the build cost advice whilst sales values are based on GL Hearn’s own research.

6.38 PWC have reviewed the modelling developed by GL Hearn and have advised:

- Profit on costs for adopting an MDS approach for Renewal demonstrate acceptable returns to a commercial developer for taking the MD role and initiating a complex development such as the Scheme.

- The costs and returns to a sub-developer as modelled are in line with expectations and acceptable to commercial house builders for serviced plots with the benefit of outline planning consent and in light of the demand for additional housing in this area.

- The build cost estimates are supported by benchmarks, with savings against these costs potentially achievable by specialist housebuilders.

- Sales values (as at a June 2015 base) on a unit basis are considered reasonable.

6.39 Officers consider that the information provided and the review supports the premise that the Scheme is viable and that there is an appropriate delivery mechanism in place. This conclusion is augmented by a number of legal agreements which Officers consider combine to further support the delivery mechanism for the Scheme in support of the potential CPO, these are;

- The Conditional Land Sale Agreement between the Council and Renewal dated 20th December 2013 relating to the Council’s freehold interest in the land around the Stadium and the Lions Centre. The sale is conditional upon Renewal entering into agreements with MFC and MCS or the interests being acquired by CPO if a private treaty agreement cannot be reached. The Agreement also includes provision for the transfer of the land back to the Council if the comprehensive scheme has not been commenced within 4 years of the transfer of the Council’s
interest to Renewal. There is therefore an incentive on Renewal to commence the Scheme as soon as is reasonably practicable within the 4 year period.

- The Section 106 Agreements entered into in March 2012 and December 2015. The requirements of the Agreements are summarised elsewhere in this Report, but it is noteworthy that financial commitments early on in the Scheme incentivise the development of later phases if returns are to be realised. Given the upfront costs of the development, including major Section 106 contributions, the returns on the Scheme do not start to be realised until Phase 3 of the development which also supports the comprehensive development.

- The CPO Indemnity Agreement entered into on 20th December 2013 which provides for Renewal to fund the cost of the land acquisition process (including by CPO) and for the subsequent transfer to Renewal of the land to complete the land assembly.

- The agreement to be entered into with the GLA in connection with the Housing Zone status of the Site which will provide Renewal with £20 million of repayable loan funding. The Agreement will bind Renewal to completing the Scheme and accelerates delivery of the new station on the East London Line, two new bus routes and improvements to existing walking and cycling routes and enables development of the first two phases of development (1A and 2) to proceed ahead of schedule delivering 532 homes earlier. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) will also be entered into between the Council and the GLA. The MoU will set out the overarching principles upon which Zone Loan Funding may be made available to Renewal and the Borough’s role in supporting delivery of the Zone Outputs. A separate report on this aspect will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet.

6.40 Although the Council does not have a directly enforceable obligation from Renewal to deliver the whole of the scheme, any such obligation would not in any event guarantee delivery. Officers remain of the opinion that the necessary resources will be available and that the Scheme will provide a sufficient return to Renewal (or another developer/developers), such that the Council can be confident that if the CPO is confirmed, Renewal will wish to proceed with the Scheme, and the Scheme will be delivered.

6.41 in all the circumstances, Officers consider that the scheme has been independently verified as viable with appropriate delivery mechanisms in place and that pre-condition IV has been met

(v) Business Plan / Funding Strategy

6.42 Renewal’s intended MDS approach will significantly reduce the level of funding which would otherwise be required. With an overall programme
of just over 10 years, the majority of costs and risks for the development of individual plots/phases will be passed to sub-developers who are likely to be national house builders.

6.43 GL Hearn have modelled the programme cash flows and these indicate that, if sunk costs are ignored, a peak debt funding requirement is reached in year 3 with the scheme almost at break even in year 4 and in surplus from year 5 onwards. If sunk costs are included the peak debt is reached in year 3 and a surplus is reached from year 7 onwards.

6.44 PWC have confirmed that they consider that the appraisals presented by GL Hearn have been properly considered and reflect Renewal's development intentions.

6.45 The other more immediate funding need and of direct focus to the Council is the ability for Renewal to fund the remaining acquisitions and support any CPO costs and expenses that arise. In the event the Council resolves to proceed with a CPO, the CPO Indemnity Agreement provides for a cash deposit or satisfactory alternative security to be in place before the Council proceeds to make a CPO. Renewal have offered a performance bond from RBS to cover the liabilities under the CPO Indemnity to the value of 175% of the estimate total costs, thereby providing a significant surplus. This is an ‘on-demand’ bond enabling the Council to require payment from RBS if Renewal fail to pay under the CPO Indemnity Agreement. Officers consider this is an acceptable form of security for the Council. It is noteworthy that the performance bond is to be given by RBS which is still in majority Government ownership. RBS will have independently assessed Renewal’s ability to cover these costs prior to it agreeing to provide such bond, which further confirms the security. The bond is further referred to in Section 8 of this Report.

6.46 Renewal has set up a project company/special purpose vehicle as the delivery vehicle for the Scheme – this is a widely recognised approach to large scale project/programme delivery. The project company is not established with sufficient resources to deliver the scheme utilising its own funds. It has always been represented that the funding for the project would be provided by the shareholders of Renewal who are Incorporated Holdings Ltd and Independent Advisors Incorporated. The Renewal Group Ltd (registered in the Isle of Man) is a 100% subsidiary of Renewal Holdings Ltd (registered in the Isle of Man) which in turn is owned on a 50/50 basis by Incorporated Holdings Ltd (IHL) (registered in the Isle of Man) and Independent Advisors Incorporated (registered in the British Virgin Isles).

6.47 PWC have confirmed that the delivery structure and funding mechanism adopted is not unusual and is common place in the delivery of large and complex developments. PWC have also reviewed the audited accounts of Renewal as at 31 December 2014 and whilst there are no audited accounts for the parent shareholders (by reason of them not being based in the UK) the financial information provided by the shareholders which indicates significant net assets. On the basis of this information
PWC suggest that the shareholders have the potential to utilise or leverage its balance sheet to cover both the initial funding and the peak debt (excluding sunk costs) finance required by the project. However, if for any reason the shareholders failed to do this then there are alternative funding strategies for the project to proceed as set out in paragraphs 6.8-6.50 below.

6.48 There is perhaps natural caution about reliance on offshore funding but it is considered that a number of factors should be taken into consideration in this regard, as follows:

- Funding for the project to date has been provided almost entirely by shareholders, with only circa 13% funded by bank debt provided by RBS. The debt provided by the shareholders is unsecured with no fixed repayment date and has 10% annual interest charges applied to the debt – the interest charges are included in the appraisal modelling. The implication therefore is that the shareholders will only see their principal investment and interest returned as the scheme is delivered.

- Therefore, PWC note that whilst there is no absolute binding commitment on behalf of the shareholders to further fund the project they have significant investment in the project already which suggest that commercially further investment is highly likely.

- PWC also note that, as is the norm at this stage of a project of this nature, Renewal has supplied a Development Agreement between themselves and its shareholders which covenants the shareholders to provide future cash flow requirements for the project. Whilst this is subject to the appraisal at the time being able to demonstrate a 10% development profit the sensitivity analysis carried out by GL Hearn identifies that property prices would need to fall by 13% across the scheme as a whole for this level of profit not to be delivered. PWC note that such a fall in house prices is not unprecedented but would represent a significant and unusual market adjustment stating that they are not aware of any credible property commentators forecasting a downturn in excess of 13%.

- PWC also note that a collapse in the housing market would not occur in isolation and that the impact on any appraisal would be mitigated by other market adjustments such as a fall in build costs which they would anticipate during a property recession. Renewal, in common with other master developers, would have the option to pause the development until such time as house prices recovered.

- The GLA has designated the whole Scheme as one of the first Housing Zones and has agreed in principle (subject to contract with Renewal and entering into a Memorandum of
Understanding with the Council) to provide a £20m public loan facility to Renewal.

6.49 There are a number of other factors which also need to be taken into consideration when assessing the business plan/funding strategy and the justification for the use of CPO powers. With

- an assembled site;
- Outline Planning Permission/S73 Permission for the comprehensive scheme, and
- the MDS delivery approach

the scheme is generally considered bankable/fundable. That is, if Renewal’s shareholders decide not to fund the scheme, it would be expected that traditional debt funding would be available to Renewal to satisfy the maximum deficit arising during the course of the project. Given the residual value of the Site post completion of the land assembly exercise, such debt funding could be secured at favourable rates (on the basis of Renewal’s shareholders fully subordinating their equity investment to date). Therefore assessing the scheme on a non-developer specific basis, it would be expected that the maximum deficit could be funded by any developer notwithstanding its financial standing or covenant strength.

6.50 PWC have also commented that if Renewal were not to proceed with the intended development the opportunity would exist for an alternative commercial developer, who should be attracted to the site and be capable of achieving returns that would be commercially acceptable. This of course pre-supposes that the Site assembly was complete and that Renewal wished to dispose or needed to dispose of the assembled Site. PWC have also noted that alternative developers would be able to achieve improved funding rates.

6.51 It is Officers opinion that, if the Council wishes to see the comprehensive redevelopment come forward, this is only likely to occur if the Site (against which the Outline Planning Permission/S73 Permission has been granted) is assembled and that the regeneration scheme will only be achieved in a reasonable time period if the Council assist the land assembly by the exercise of its CPO powers.

6.52 The Indemnity aspects are covered in the financial implications at Section 8 below.

6.53 In all the circumstances, Officers’ are of the view that the Scheme is viable and deliverable, and has a reasonable prospect of coming forward in a reasonable timescale in the event the Council secures compulsory purchase powers to complete the land assembly exercise.

6.54 Based on the above considerations, Officers believe that a suitable business plan and funding strategy exists to ensure that the
Scheme can be brought forward in a reasonable timescale and that pre-condition V has been met.

(vi) Equalities Impact

6.55 The Council’s statutory duty pursuant to the Equality Act is summarised in Section 11 of this Report. A Regeneration and Equalities Statement has been completed in respect of the proposed Compulsory Purchase Order.

6.56 A summary of the Regeneration and Equalities Statement is included within Section 12 of the draft SoR.

Officers consider pre-condition (vi) has been met.

7.0 Acquisition of land currently owned by Renewal

7.1 As indicated above, Renewal already own a significant proportion of the land required for the development. Renewal has analysed the position regarding third party rights over the land it already owns (and land to be acquired) which may affect its ability to implement the scheme. Renewal has appointed Bilfinger GVA (GVA) to provide specialist input on rights of light.

7.2 GVA have been provided with the parameter plans for the permitted Scheme which detail the maximum and minimum heights of the various buildings. Using accepted methods of assessment, including computer modelling, land registry documents and any information that they can source regarding the internal layout of buildings, GVA have undertaken an assessment to identify the level of impact on rights of light of neighbouring properties. In identifying properties that would be ‘injured’ by the proposed development, an assessment is taken to identify whether the level of light entering through a window will change as a result of the construction of a new development. This is evaluated by assessing the amount of sky visibility (at 0.2%) available on the working plane, which is defined as the top of a table 850mm from the floor, on a ‘before development’ and ‘after development’ basis.

7.3 Based on case law, GVA have classified that a property is injured where the extent of a room that is lit at the 0.2% sky visibility level reduces to a level below 50%. Where a room already is lit to a level of below 50% of its area, then any further reduction, regardless of extent, will constitute an injury. The conclusion that a property has had an injury in respect to its right of light does not suggest that a room no longer receives any light (although in extreme cases this may be the case), just that the new development will result in an interference which results in the lit area of the room falling below 50%.

7.4 GVA conclude that an actionable level of interference will be caused to 54 properties as a result of the proposed development. Of these, 21 are held by the Council in a single freehold title, 32 are private residential units and the other interest affected is the MFC Stadium. A plan is
attached to this Report at Appendix 8, which shows the residential properties affected and the buildings which will interfere with the rights of light. These comprise flats and maisonettes within the apartment blocks at Bridge Meadows, Chilham House, and Reculver House (which are occupied by a mix of secure tenants and long leaseholders who have exercised the right to buy) and also by the MFC Stadium. The Council owns the freehold interest in Chilham House and Reculver House and the right of light attaching to the Council’s interest will also be interfered with. The impact on rights of light vary between minor, moderate, significant or severe.

7.5 A further plan is attached at Appendix 8 which shows the cutbacks in the development which would be required to avoid the interference. Avoiding such interference is, however, unworkable in that it is not a matter of simply moving or re-orientating buildings to avoid an interference with rights of light; a significant number of buildings would have to reduce in size considerably. Four of the towers (one in phase 1A one in phase 1B and two in phase 3) would be reduced to the height of the podiums they sit upon reflecting a cumulative loss of over 60 storeys of residential accommodation alone, 3 other buildings are lost completely (over 20 storeys of development) and 12 other structures, including the sports centre, would need to reduce in height. The accommodation to be provided in these buildings could not be replaced elsewhere on the Site given the design already maximises the potential of other blocks.

7.6 To avoid interfering with rights of light would mean the number of units delivered on the Site would have to be significantly reduced. The impact on the level of residential accommodation which could be delivered on the Site would be substantial and would result in the development opportunity not being maximised. A portion of the new sports facility would also be lost. GL Hearn has advised that the loss of the residential accommodation would have a significant impact on the development’s viability, likely prejudicing the delivery of other aspects of the Scheme and the public benefits of the wider development being realised.

7.7 In terms of assessing whether it is necessary to interfere with the rights in question, this involves both consideration not only as to whether the interference is physically necessary, but also as to whether agreement might be reached with those with the benefit of the right for release of the right. Renewal or the Council has approached those with the benefit of the rights to light with a view to reaching agreement regarding release of the rights, subject to payment of consideration. Those affected have been notified of the potential impact and offered an opportunity to meet to discuss the matter further and undertake a survey of their property in order to accurately assess any impact. To date only one response has been received, with the respondent requesting a survey. This is being taken forward by GL Hearn

7.8 Unless the rights of light are released or overridden, those with the benefit of the rights could seek to prevent the re-development scheme
proceeding so far as it interferes with their rights. Section 237 of the 1990 Act authorises interference with third party rights such as easements, restrictive covenants etc in respect of land acquired (by agreement or compulsorily) or appropriated by a local authority for planning purposes, where the interference results from development in accordance with planning permission. Rights of light are considered to be rights encompassed by Section 237 of the 1990 Act. Note that an authority can only appropriate land it already owns, so appropriation is not relevant for present purposes.

7.9 Note also that if and to the extent the land affected by the rights of light might be acquired by the Council through CPO, then as that would be an acquisition for planning purposes under Section 226 of the 1990 Act, under Section 237, Section 237 will be engaged through that process. We are therefore only dealing here with land already owned by Renewal or which might be acquired by Renewal by private treaty.

7.10 The protection in Section 237 applies not only to the local authority, but also to anyone deriving title from it. Where Section 237 is engaged, any interference with a third party right is converted to an entitlement to compensation based on the reduction in value of the third party’s land attributable to the interference with the rights attaching to it.

7.11 As indicated above, Section 237 is engaged by an acquisition by a local authority for planning purposes. The power to acquire land for planning purposes is contained in Sections 226 (compulsory acquisition) and 227 (acquisition by agreement) of the 1990 Act. Under Section 227, a local authority can acquire land for the purposes for which they might be authorised to acquire it compulsorily under Section 226. Thus, when acquiring by agreement, the local authority must be satisfied the acquisition fulfils the same tests as apply to power of compulsory acquisition under Section 226. The Section 226 tests are set out in paragraph 6.16 of this report which cross refers to the relevant section of the draft SoR.

7.12 Officers consider that the acquisition of Renewal’s land for planning purposes, with the consequence that this will engage Section 237 of the 1990 Act, will facilitate the carrying out of the development, re-development or improvement of the Site. It will enable the development to be constructed pursuant to the planning permissions which have been granted notwithstanding it involves interference with third party rights which might otherwise impede the development.

7.13 Officers propose that the land owned by Renewal (including land shown on the Acquisition Plan which may subsequently be acquired by Renewal by private treaty) upon which the construction of the consented buildings will interfere with rights should be acquired by the Council and disposed back to Renewal, thus engaging Section 237 of the 1990 Act. It is considered that this will facilitate the development by ensuring the third party rights do not prejudice delivery of the scheme. It will also contribute to delivery of the well-being benefits in the greater public interest, as identified in Section 3 of the SoR.
7.14 The arrangement will enable third party rights to be interfered with and in considering whether to proceed, consideration should be given to the protections under Human Rights legislation. Section 11 addresses the application of Article 8 of the Convention (of relevance to residential occupiers) and Article 1 of the First Protocol applies to both individuals and other legal persons and so is also of application to the rights held by corporate entities for example.

7.15 In considering the approach, the action must be proportionate and represent a fair balance between public interest and private rights: Is it proportionate? Having regard to the significant regenerative, well-being and other public and economic benefits to be delivered through the re-development proposals, it is considered that the degree of interference is necessary in the interests of the economic well-being of the country (in the terms set out in Article 8), is in the public interest (in the terms set out in Article 1, Protocol 1 rights) and is proportionate in each case. As referred to above, any third party interference with third party rights will carry a right to compensation in respect of any diminution in value caused to the third parties’ property as a result of the interference.

7.16 Once acquired, Section 233 of the 1990 Act authorises the Council to dispose of any land held for planning purposes, in such manner and subject to such conditions as appear to the local authority to be expedient to secure the best use of that land/buildings or works which have been, or are to be, erected, constructed or carried out on the land or to secure the erection, construction or carrying out of buildings or works appearing to them to be needed for the proper planning of their area. Section 233 requires Secretary of State consent to any disposal which is for a consideration less than that reasonably obtainable and is not a disposal/assignment of a lease of 7 years or less. The Council has been advised by GL Hearn in respect of valuation matters concerning the Section 237 transaction, including certifying that the disposal under such transaction satisfies the requirements of Section 233 of the 1990 Act. The Council has also been advised that the proposed structure gives rise to minimal SDLT liabilities which in any event will be Renewal’s responsibility.

7.17 Heads of terms for the proposed transaction have been agreed, subject to Mayor and Cabinet approval, between Officers and Renewal. These are attached at Appendix 4.

7.18 Renewal as developer will be primarily responsible for any compensation payable under Section 237 of the 1990 Act. The Council will, however, retain residual liability in the event Renewal fails to discharge its liability. It is therefore appropriate that Renewal should indemnify the Council in respect of such residual liability. Officers recommend that the CPO Indemnity Agreement should be varied to encompass any such liability, thus ensuring the performance bond to be given by RBS also provides security for this potential additional liability.
7.19 Members are asked to approve the acquisition and disposal and the variation to the CPO Indemnity Agreement for the reasons set out in this report.

8.0 Financial implications

8.1 As provided for in the CPO Indemnity Agreement, all costs incurred by the Council in connection with the acquisition process are to be met by Renewal, including, by way of summary:

- Administrative Costs of the CPO, including time spent by Council staff and fees incurred on consultants in advising on land acquisition/CPO aspects and progressing the CPO and land referencing aspects;

- legal costs (including in respect of time incurred by the Council’s legal section and also fees incurred by the external legal advisers and in engaging Counsel);

- other CPO related expenses, including all costs, fees and expenses relating to any public inquiry (if there is one) in respect of the CPO, any costs related to purchase or blight notices etc;

(The above costs are subject to interim invoicing to Renewal under the terms of the CPO Indemnity Agreement).

- Land acquisition and compensation costs (including land value, acquisition costs and disturbance payments to all affected landowners, lessees or tenants which arise from the acquisition of their interest;

- Any compensation payments payable (in addition to those arising from acquisition), including for example, statutory disturbance payments, payments in respect of injurious affection, interference with third party rights etc, in consequence of the Scheme.

8.2 As set out in Section 7 of this Report, it is proposed that the CPO Indemnity Agreement is varied to ensure it covers the compensation and other costs which the Council may incur in consequence of the proposed acquisition of Renewal’s freehold interest (both the existing freehold and any freehold interest which may subsequently be acquired by Renewal by private treaty) in land within Phase 1A, 1B, 2 and 3 as identified on the Acquisition Plan, and the lease back of the relevant land on the terms set out in Appendix 8. The comments on the CPO Indemnity Agreement apply equally to the agreement as proposed to be varied.

8.3 As explained elsewhere in this Report, the CPO Indemnity Agreement provides for a cash deposit or alternative security to be put in place following a CPO Resolution to cover the costs secured under the CPO Indemnity Agreement. Renewal proposes to provide an on-demand
performance bond from RBS in respect of all costs and expenses payable under the CPO Indemnity Agreement. In the event that Renewal does not provide the bond then the Council is not obliged to proceed with the CPO or to undertake any other steps under the CPO Indemnity Agreement until security for the costs is in place. Officers advise that the Council should not proceed to make the CPO unless a satisfactory Deposit or alternative security is in place.

8.4 In terms of project management, the CPO project is being led by the Council’s Director of Regeneration and Asset Management, with input from the Head of Planning, Head of Law, and the Executive Director of Resources. Joint working has taken place with Renewal and their professional advisors on the preparation and making of the CPO and will continue in its progress through to confirmation and implementation.

8.5 In terms of risk management, Renewal will continue to negotiate with landowners and wherever possible acquire all necessary land and rights by agreement during the preparation and making of the CPO and thereafter, and until such time as the Council considers it reasonable to take over the negotiations and/or acquire the land compulsorily.

8.6 The Council’s costs which include internal and external costs (e.g. legal input and other consultants) and costs incurred on land acquisition matters, including compensation matters, are rechargeable to Renewal under the CPO Indemnity Agreement. Any financial exposure of the Council is currently minimised as costs are billed regularly to Renewal. Any failure to pay entitles the Council to ‘down tools’ under the CPO Indemnity Agreement. Once a CPO resolution is made, as explained above, provisions are in place for a cash deposit or alternative security to be provided. Officers consider the proposed RBS on-demand performance bond to provide appropriate security.

8.7 Once the CPO process gets underway, the Council may be legally obliged to take steps at certain stages which will result in expense. With the performance bond in place, however, any financial exposure to the Council is mitigated. Any risk of the performance bond being insufficient to cover the costs of the CPO has also been mitigated by the amount of the bond being substantially higher than the amount currently estimated as being required to cover the costs of the CPO, including any rights of light claims. Should it transpire at any time that the bond is considered insufficient to cover the likely costs, then the CPO Indemnity Agreement provides a process for increasing the amount under the security with the Council not being obliged to take further steps until the amount had been increased.

8.8 Throughout the process Officers would seek to ensure that the security is adequate to cover the Council’s exposure through full monitoring and anticipation of costs and ensuring, should it become necessary, additional sums are secured under the security.

8.9 In terms of holding any land acquired under the CPO, the intention is to transfer all interests to Renewal as soon as practicable. In order to
minimise this risk the transfer will be made as soon as possible after the
land has been acquired, and mechanisms such as holding irrevocable
deeds of transfer to Renewal will be explored so that the risk (if any)
only lasts for the minimum possible time.

8.10 Officers are satisfied that the arrangements outlined above mean that
any financial exposure to the Council in relation to the CPO process can
be mitigated to avoid material exposure. The CPO Indemnity Agreement
has been drafted to minimise the risk to the Council, and Renewal has a
strong and proven track record of meeting the Council’s costs to date.

8.11 In relation to the acquisition under Section 227 and disposal to
Renewal, the Council has been advised by GL Hearn that in terms of
compliance with s 233 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 there are
no issues and following the CPO order the Council has been advised
that the initial acquisition by the Council of a third party land interest will
be SDLT exempt and only Renewal will incur SDLT on the transfer to
them (which will be its responsibility).

Financial due diligence (linked to pre-conditions (iv & v)

8.12 In September 2013, at the point of recommending to the Mayor that the
Council enter into the Conditional Land Sale Agreement, Officers noted
that the recommendation for the CPO resolution would not be brought
forward until such time as “full financial due diligence has been
undertaken and officers are satisfied that Renewal Group Limited has a
viable business plan and funding strategy to deliver the scheme.”

8.13 To this end the Council commissioned independent advice from PWC to
undertake a due diligence review of Renewal’s overall ability to deliver
the New Bermondsey development scheme and its financial standing.
PWC’s review is based in large part on their assessment of the GL
Hearn report commissioned by Renewal and which included a review of
the viability of the Scheme. The key conclusions of both the PWC report
and GL Hearn report are as set out in Section 6 of this Report.

8.14 Overall the conclusions are that the scheme is viable, that the costs of
the CPO will be covered by the on-demand performance bond (once
signed) and that the Scheme can either be financed by Renewal’s
shareholder companies (though it should be noted that financial
information provided by the shareholders is unaudited as the
shareholders are based offshore) or potentially through debt finance or
on the basis the assembled scheme would be attractive to another
developer.

8.15 Renewal Group Limited (registered in the Isle of Man) is a 100%
subsidiary of Renewal Holdings Limited (also registered in the Isle of
Man) which in turn is owned on a 50/50 basis by Incorporated Holdings
Ltd (IHL) (registered in the Isle of Man) and Independent Advisors
Incorporated (IAA) (registered in the British Virgin Isles). Renewal has
confirmed that IAI is ultimately controlled by a family trust and that IHL
is ultimately controlled by a charitable trust. The Council should note
that the nature of the unaudited information provided including ownership means that it has not been independently verified.

8.16 In relation to the RBS performance bond, paragraphs 8.1 – 8.8 above set out the Council’s rights under the CPO Indemnity Agreement and this is considered to mitigate material financial exposure to the Council. The bond must be in place before the Council proceeds with any CPO.

9.0 Risk Assessment

9.1 A risk register has been prepared for this project and a Project Implementation Document (PID) has been prepared and will be monitored by the Council’s SCT Proposed CPO Board. The CPO Indemnity Agreement of December 2013 is considered to provide the Council with a robust mitigation mechanism for all the protection it needs to avoid almost all financial risks, and Section 8 discusses any financial risk to the Council.

10.0 Comments from the Head of Planning

10.1 The Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) sets out the vision, objectives, strategy and policies to manage development in the Borough over the next 15 years (2011 to 2026). The Core Strategy is the Council’s key planning policy document and together with Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan forms the development plan for the Borough. The Core Strategy allocates five sites in the north of the Borough as ‘strategic sites’ one of which is New Bermondsey under its former name of the Surrey Canal Triangle (Core Strategy Strategic Site Allocation 3, SSA3).

10.2 The strategic sites are considered central to the achievement of the Core Strategy as redevelopment can collectively transform the physical environment and achieve place making objectives by delivering a comprehensive range of regeneration outcomes in the Borough’s most deprived areas. This includes significant numbers of new homes, a range of economic, employment and training opportunities, accessibility improvements (public transport, pedestrian and cycle), and infrastructure provision and public realm improvements.

10.3 The Scheme represents an opportunity to transform the environment and infrastructure and create a new destination around the Borough’s premier sporting destination (Millwall Stadium) which currently is not enhanced or improved by the surrounding industrial estates.

10.4 The Core Strategy policy (SSA3) allocates the Site for mixed use development and requires a comprehensive phase approach to redevelopment in line with an approved Masterplan. For the purposes of this Site, the outline planning application and supporting documentation which the Council resolved to approve on 13th October 2011, also carried through to the Section 73 application, represents the Site’s masterplan. The policy seeks to create a ‘destination’ that could act to focus and attract other regeneration opportunities. It ensures
development facilitates and takes advantage of the proposed new station on the London Overground network and the existing sporting and leisure facilities at Millwall Stadium to create a new high quality destination in an area which is relatively devoid of local facilities. Specifically the policy:

- ensures the continued operations of Millwall Stadium and supports its potential redevelopment;
- seeks a range of uses including employment, retail, housing (up to 2,400 new homes), leisure and community;
- makes provision for a range of infrastructure including the London Overground Station at Surrey Canal Road and substantial improvements to walking and cycling routes, including on-site amenity space;
- ensures high quality design of all new buildings and spaces.

10.5 The Core Strategy is intended to encourage third party landowners and developers to bring forward their land and buildings for redevelopment where appropriate. The Council has been working with landowners and their agents to assist the process of bringing forward development within the earliest possible period. This particularly applies to the strategic site allocations. However, it is accepted that there may be instances where landowners may be reluctant or unwilling to bring forward their land for development. In such circumstances the Council may choose to use its compulsory purchase powers to achieve the Core Strategy’s wider regeneration objectives (paragraph 9.24, Core Strategy).

11.0 Legal implications

11.1 The Mayor is being asked to consider the exercise of the powers under Section 226(1)(a) of the 1990 Act and Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to make a CPO for the acquisition of land and new rights. The legal requirements and appropriate cross-references to the draft SoR are covered within this Report and the draft SoR.

11.2 In exercising the powers, the Council must also have regard to the CPO Guidance. The overarching requirement to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest is set out in paragraph 6.24–6.27 of this Report, together with the additional factors which the Council must have regard to in making its decision.

11.3 The Mayor is also being asked to authorise the acquisition for planning purposes under Section 227 of the 1990 Act of Renewal’s current and future freehold interests in land at 1A, 1B, 2, 3 and 4 and the lease back of that land to Renewal (with an option for Renewal to repurchase
the freehold interest). The circumstances and implications of this arrangement are set out in Section 7 of this Report.

Section 237

11.3 Land acquired by the Council for the Scheme whether by private treaty or pursuant to CPO will be acquired for planning purposes under Section 226 or 227 of the 1990 Act. The land will be acquired subject to any existing interests and rights belonging to third parties, including rights of light, and the land will be sold subject to any such interests and rights on disposal. However, under Section 237 of the 1990 Act, the development of land which has been acquired or appropriated for planning purposes in accordance with planning permission is authorised, notwithstanding that it would interfere with any interests or rights affecting the land. The benefit of Section 237 passes to persons deriving title from the local authority, provided the interference is caused by development with planning permission and there remains sufficient connection between the development and the original purpose of acquisition. The ability to rely upon Section 237 removes the potential for excessive compensation claims and the ability for owners to obtain injunctions preventing the redevelopment or claim damages.

11.4 Where rights are interfered with, the owners of any such interests are entitled to compensation as provided for in Section 237 of the 1990 Act. The primary responsibility for payment of compensation rests with the developer, but the local authority retains residual liability in the event the developer defaults. The CPO Indemnity Agreement requires Renewal to pay any Section 237 compensation. This is considered to be in respect of third party land, however, and not any Section 237 compensation which would arise from the acquisition and lease back of Renewal’s land as set out in Section 7 of this Report. It is therefore proposed that the CPO Indemnity Agreement is varied to ensure Renewal is responsible for the compensation and costs arising in respect of any interference with rights in respect of the land the subject of that proposed transaction.

Equality Act 2010 Implications

11.6 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) brings together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act includes a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The duty covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

11.7 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
• eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;

• advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;

• foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

11.8 As was the case for the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

11.9 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/

11.10 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

11.11 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/.
11.12 Paragraph 6.55 of this Report refers to the Equalities Analysis Assessment which has been carried out in this case and cross-refers to the summary of that assessment in Section 12 of the draft S of R.

**Human Rights Act 1998 Implications**

11.13 The Act effectively incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights into UK law and requires all public authorities to have regard to Convention Rights. In making decisions Members therefore need to have regard to the Convention. The rights that are of particular significance to the Mayor's decision are those contained in Articles 8 (right to home life) and Article 1 of Protocol 1 (peaceful enjoyment of possessions).

11.14 Article 8 provides that there should be no interference with the existence of the right except in accordance with the law and, as necessary in a democratic society in the interest of the economic well-being of the country, protection of health and the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. Article 1 of the 1st Protocol provides that no-one shall be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest and subject to the conditions provided for by law although it is qualified to the effect that it should not in any way impair the right of a state to enforce such laws as it deems necessary to control the uses of property in accordance with the general interest.

11.15 In determining the level of permissible interference with enjoyment the courts have held that any interference must achieve a fair balance between the general interests of the community and the protection of the rights of individuals. There must be reasonable proportionality between the means employed and the aim pursued. The availability of an effective remedy and compensation to affected persons is relevant in assessing whether a fair balance has been struck.

11.16 It is acknowledged that a CPO is made and confirmed will result in the taking of property. However, this will be in accordance with a statutory process which was held to be compliant with Article 6 of the Convention which provides that "everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law". Compensation will be payable in accordance with law including compensation for property on the basis of the market value of the interest acquired, together with disturbance, statutory loss payment and where appropriate home loss payments.

11.17 In making the recommendations in this Report, Officers have carefully considered the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest. In this instance it is considered that there is a compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition and this is consistent with the ECHR and 1998 Act in that the public purpose of securing the Site for the redevelopment described herein and concomitant economic, social and environmental benefits are of sufficient weight to override the interference with human rights that a
CPO necessarily involves; and that compulsory acquisition is necessary to achieve that purpose.

11.18 It is also considered that the Order is proportionate having regard to the alternative means of securing the redevelopment of the Order Land and the associated regeneration of the area.

12.0 Environmental Implications

12.1 There are no immediate environmental implications associated with the recommendations of this report. The planning report referred to in the background papers has the environmental implications concerning the scheme.

13.0 Crime and disorder implications

13.1 There are no immediate implications associated with the recommendations of this report. The planning report referred to in the background papers has the implications concerning the scheme.

14.0 Conclusion

14.1 Each of the Pre-Conditions to making a CPO set out in the 7th March 2012 Report, have been considered by Officers, and have now been addressed by Renewal.

14.4 On balance, the Mayor is recommended to resolve to make a CPO and to agree the other recommendations set out in paragraph 3 of this Report.

Background Papers

Copies of all background papers have been made available in the members' room prior to the meeting at which this report is due for consideration. The papers are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short title of document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>File Location</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee Report</td>
<td>13.10.11</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Michael Forrester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the North and South of Surrey Canal Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee Report</td>
<td>12.12.13</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Michael Forrester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the North and South of Surrey Canal Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT “in principle” CPO and land appropriation report</td>
<td>7.3.12</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Rob Holmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Canal Triangle Regeneration – Update on Land Assembly and</td>
<td>13.9.13</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Rob Holmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Land Sale Agreement between LBL and Renewal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Canal Regeneration Benefits and Equalities Report</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Rob Holmans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document is the Statement of Reasons for the above Compulsory Purchase Order, namely, The London Borough of Lewisham (Land to the north and south of Surrey Canal Road, London SE14, 15 and 16 and forming part of the New Bermondsey Site) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015 (Order). The land and interests in the land included within the Order are referred to as ‘the Order Land’.

1.2 The London Borough of Lewisham (the Council) is the local planning authority and acquiring authority for the administrative area that includes the Order Land. The Council has made the Order and has submitted it to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Secretary of State) for confirmation. The Order was made under Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (1990 Act), Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (1976 Act) and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. The Order will, if confirmed by the Secretary of State, authorise the compulsory acquisition of land and new rights to enable the Scheme (as defined below) to be delivered.

1.3 The Order Land lies to the north and south of Surrey Canal Road. It forms part of land known as the New Bermondsey Site (Site). The Site was formerly known as the Surrey Canal Triangle site.

1.4 A location plan of the Site is attached at Appendix A. References to the ‘Site’ in this Statement of Reasons are references to the site as shown edged red on the location plan. The Order Land is shown shaded pink and blue on the Order Map attached at Appendix B.

1.5 The Council considers that acquisition of the Order Land will facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement on the Order Land. In considering whether to exercise such power the Council has, as is required, had regard to Section 226(1A) of the 1990 Act and considers that the proposed redevelopment will promote and/or improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the Council’s administrative area.

1.6 Re-development of the Site is a key regeneration priority for the Council and the purpose of the Order is to enable re-development of the Site in line with applicable planning policy and the Council’s corporate objectives. The purpose for which the Order Land is required is considered to meet the objectives of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011), the Lewisham Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011) (Core Strategy) and the National Planning Policy Framework March 2012 (NPPF). Accordingly, it fits with the adopted/applicable planning framework for the area within which the Order Land and the Site are situated.

1.7 The Site is situated within New Cross ward in the north west corner of the Borough of Lewisham (Borough), adjacent to the London Borough of Southwark. The Core Strategy is

---

1 Order Map as per CPO when made.

2 These comprise the Minor Alterations to the London Plan (October 2013) and Further Alterations to the London Plan (March 2015).
the Council's key planning policy document which sets out the vision, objectives, strategy and policies to manage development in the Borough over the period 2011 to 2026.

1.8 The Core Strategy allocates five sites in the north of the Borough as ‘strategic sites’. Four of the strategic sites are within the Deptford/New Cross area of the Borough. They include the Site under its former name of Surrey Canal Triangle.

1.9 Pursuant to Strategic Site Allocation 3 (SSA3) within the Core Strategy, the Site is allocated for comprehensive mixed use development. The supporting text to SSA3 describes the Site as presenting a degraded low quality environment which is overwhelmingly industrial in character and notes with industrial estates which are closed off and inward looking and a wider area which suffers from a good deal of severance caused by railway lines on wide viaducts creating an environment which discourages pedestrian access and connectivity.

1.10 The Core Strategy identifies the Site as an opportunity to transform the environment and infrastructure and create a new destination around the Borough's premier sporting destination, Millwall Football Stadium, which currently is not enhanced or improved by the surrounding industrial estates. It highlights that re-development of the Site, with the retention or replacement of existing employment uses on-site would contribute to the economy of Lewisham, increase its diversity and offer new types of jobs and training opportunities that are currently limited locally.

1.11 The Core Strategy in turn builds on the vision outlined in 'Shaping our future', Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 – 2020. This includes the 'Dynamic and Prosperous' theme, where people are part of vibrant communities and town centres, well connected to London and beyond. It details the Local Strategic Partnership’s commitment to 'improving the quality and vitality of Lewisham's town centres and localities', and aspirations to 'support the growth and development of our town centres by working with commercial partners and developers', and to 'maximise the use of our town centres as places to engage the local community'.

1.12 'People, prosperity, place', Lewisham's Regeneration Strategy 2008-2020, sets out the Council's aspiration for a vibrant, dynamic Lewisham focussed around the themes of people - investing in the individuals and communities which are Lewisham’s greatest asset - prosperity - fostering the skills and economic opportunities for Lewisham to flourish and thrive - and place - developing high quality public spaces, sustainable buildings and protecting the areas which are sensitive to change. The strategy is also placed within the framework of the key national and regional policies which affect the Council’s work around regeneration of the Borough, including the London Plan.

1.13 Renewal Group Limited (Developer) proposes to develop the Site. Further details of how it intends to deliver the Scheme are contained in Section 6 of this Statement of Reasons.

1.14 In January 2011, the Developer submitted an outline planning application to the Council in respect of the re-development of the Site. On 30 March 2012, the Council granted outline planning permission under reference number DC/11/76357 (Outline Planning Permission) for the comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of the site for up to 240,000 square metres (GEA) of development comprising:

- Class A1/A2 (Shops and Financial and Professional Services) up to 3,000 square metres;
- Class A3/A4 (Cafes/Restaurants and Drinking Establishments) up to 3,000 square metres;
- Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) up to 300 square metres;
- Class B1 (Business) between 10,000 -15,000 square metres;
• Class C1 (Hotels) up to 10,000 square metres;
• Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) between 150,000 - 190,000 square metres (up to 2,400 homes of different sizes and types);
• Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions) between 400 - 10,000 square metres;
• Class D2 (Leisure and Assembly) between 4,260 - 15,800 square metres

involving the demolition of all existing buildings on the site with the exception of the Millwall FC Stadium (which is to be retained and its façade upgraded and /or re-clad), Plot Excelsior 2 – Guild House (which is to be retained and extended) and Plot Excelsior 5 – Rollins House (which is to be retained, but not altered or extended as part of the planning application)

1.15 The Outline Planning Permission also encompasses the demolition and replacement of the existing Millwall FC grounds-person’s store of approximately 140 square metres, re-profiling of site levels, alterations to Surrey Canal road, the re-alignment of the Bolina Road, new streets and other means of access and circulation, including pedestrian/cycle paths, carriageways and servicing areas, areas for parking for emergency services vehicles and outside broadcast units, external areas of land and soft landscaping and publicly accessible open space, car and coach parking areas and accesses to them, cycle storage and, supporting infrastructure works and facilities including sub-stations, energy centre(s), District Heating Network (DHN) connections to and between each plot and the proposed energy centre and the adjoining South East London Combined Heat and Power (SELCHP) plant (to the extent to which they lie within the planning application Boundary) and an ENVAC waste storage and handling system (including DNH and ENVAC connections to plots south of Surrey Canal Road under the carriageway of Surrey Canal Road, as altered.

1.16 The Outline Planning Permission was subject to a Section 106 Agreement (Original S106 Agreement) entered into on the same date and securing a number of commitments and obligations. Details of the Original S106 Agreement are in Section 4 below.

1.17 In October 2013, the Developer submitted an application under Section 73 of the 1990 Act (reference number DC/13/85143) for minor material amendments to the Outline Planning Permission to vary conditions on the Outline Planning Permission to enable reconfiguration of buildings on plots known as Timber Wharf, Stockholm 1 and 2 and Senegal Way 1 and 2 and the redistribution of land uses between these plots. On 18 December 2015, the Council granted permission in respect of the S73 Application (S73 Permission). The S73 Permission is subject to a Section 106 Agreement entered into on the same date and applying (with appropriate modifications) the obligations in the Original Section 106 Agreement to the development comprised in the S73 Permission. References below to ‘S106 Agreement’ include the Original Section 106 Agreement and the Section 106 Agreement entered into in respect of the S73 Permission.

1.18 In February 2015 the Site was designated as one of the first of the Mayor of London’s Housing Zones. Housing Zones status has been awarded to areas identified as key opportunity sites, to maximise development, fast track homes and deliver much-needed infrastructure to boost development. As one of the first Housing Zones, the Scheme is recognised as a key development in London and it is one of the few regeneration projects that has the capacity to deliver homes for Londoners, faster. As a result of Housing Zone status, the Developer will secure £20 million of loan funding from the GLA/Treasury which will facilitate delivery of key infrastructure, including the new New Bermondsey Station, two new bus routes and improvements to existing walking and cycle routes. Delivery of these transport links will provide significant benefit for the 40,000 people already living within a 15 minute walk of the site and will also enable the Developer to start phase 1A and 2 at the same time, rather than consecutively, accelerating delivery of 532 new homes. A programme of regular monitoring meetings will be agreed between the GLA, the Developer and the Council to enable this accelerated delivery.
1.19 Layout plans of the development under the Outline Planning Permission and the S73 Permission are attached at Appendix C. The Developer has stated its intention to implement the S73 Permission rather than the Original Outline Consent.

1.20 In addition to securing the wider regeneration of a poor and deprived area of North Lewisham and contributing the regeneration of the wider area, the Scheme will deliver a number of key benefits including:

- facilitating the redevelopment of the Order Land to create a new, high quality mixed use neighbourhood in an allocated strategic site to provide a place to work, shop, be entertained and live;

- the delivery of a range of modern employment and business space including retail and leisure premises (including hotel), office accommodation, and space for creative/digital industries which will diversify the local economy and provide new employment opportunities;

- the delivery of new housing in a highly publically accessible and sustainable location;

- the creation of a new transport interchange including the provision of a new station on the East London Line and two new bus routes;

- improving the physical environment and connectivity between the site and neighbouring areas through the creation of new cycling and pedestrian routes, enhancement of metropolitan open land and parkland (Bridge House Meadows), creation of new public squares and improvements to existing pedestrian access routes resulting in a new and improved setting for Millwall Football Club and local residents;

- the delivery of a modern, state-of-the-art regional sports complex which will provide specialist training facilities for local residents and athletes across the south-east of England and provide a new location for Millwall Community Scheme;

- the provision of new community facilities including GP facilities, medical centre, a new faith and community centre and a new home for the Council’s multi-faith and multi-cultural resources centre.

Further details of these key outputs are discussed elsewhere in this Statement of Reasons.

1.21 The Scheme is intended to be implemented in seven phases numbered 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 5A. A plan identifying the Phases is attached at Appendix D.

1.22 The Developer has been assembling the Site since 2004 and now owns or controls the majority of the land interests required for the Scheme, excluding highways plots and land currently vested in the Council. In summary, there are a total of 96 separate titles within the Site. The Developer has completed the purchase of 66 titles, entered into sale agreements in respect of 6 titles and there remain 24 titles to be acquired (excluding highways plots) which are comprised within the Order Land. Of the 24 outstanding interests, 4 are minor reversionary interests with the Developer already holding a substantive long leasehold interest. A plan identifying the Developer’s ownership (Developer’s Land) is attached at Appendix E, together with a table setting out the interests acquired and the title numbers.3

1.23 The Order includes all outstanding land interests and new rights necessary to facilitate the carrying out of the Scheme. The Council owns the freehold interest in the land identified on the Order Map as Plots [].

---

3 To be included and reflect position when Order made.
1.24 The Council has entered into a conditional land sale agreement with the Developer, under which the Council agreed to sell and the Developer agreed to buy the Council’s freehold interests in Plots [], excluding the land upon which the Millwall FC Stadium sits.

1.25 The Order includes interests in land where the Council owns the freehold interest.

1.26 On 7 March 2012, the Council resolved in principle to use its compulsory purchase powers under section 226(1)(a) of the 1990 Act to facilitate re-development of the Site. The resolution was subject to a number of pre-conditions, all of which are considered to have been satisfied as discussed elsewhere in this Statement of Reasons. The resolution also delegated authority to relevant Council Officers to negotiate and enter into an Indemnity Agreement with the Developer. That agreement was duly completed on 20 December 2013.

1.27 Bolina Road is no longer a through road. It provides access to the industrial units at Bolina Road and the Enterprise Industrial Estate, both of which will be replaced by the new development. As part of the scheme the road will be integrated with the urban realm surrounding the new buildings. As the existing road is maintained at the public expense, the local highway authority will not permit certain surface treatments on account of the cost of maintenance falling on the public purse. Whilst not essential to enable the scheme to be carried out, stopping up the road and transferring the land to Renewal will allow Renewal to upgrade the road surface to create a consistent urban realm, manage and maintain the road. Network Rail may need to be granted a right of way over the road to access the arch and their land on the north side of the viaduct.

1.28 It is proposed that a stopping up order in respect of Bolina Road will be sought under Highways Act powers. It is anticipated that any other requirements for road closures will be dealt with through appropriate Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

1.29 The Order Land is required for the Council to achieve its regeneration objectives for the area within a realistic timescale. Although reasonable efforts have been made, and will continue to be made, to acquire the necessary land and rights by agreement, it is clear that the Order is required to ensure there is sufficient certainty that the Scheme can come forward within a reasonable timescale. Compulsory purchase will enable the re-development to take place in a timely fashion in order to derive the wider public benefits that the Scheme will secure and also provide certainty for the programming of the Scheme and realisation of the policy objectives.

1.30 The Developer, with the Council’s assistance continues to seek to acquire the outstanding interests by agreement and details of negotiations are contained within Section 8 of this Statement of Reasons. Discussions will continue with landowners of relevant interests who are willing to sell by agreement at market value in accordance with the compensation code, with a view to limiting the number of interests which need to be acquired compulsorily. The approach adopted by the Council is in accordance with Government’s ‘Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Crichel Down Rules for the disposal of surplus land acquired by, or under the threat of, compulsion’ issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government in October 2015 (CPO Guidance).

1.31 This Statement of Reasons has been prepared in accordance with the advice set out in Section 1 of Tier 2 of the CPO Guidance and has regard to the other requirements of the CPO Guidance. The Statement of Reasons sets out the Council’s reasons for making the Order. It provides a description of the Order Land, outlines the Council’s purpose in seeking to acquire it and the case for compulsory purchase in the context of national and local policy. It is intended to be as comprehensive as possible so as to form the basis of the Council’s Statement of Case which is required to be served under Rule 7 of the Compulsory Purchase (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007.

1.32 The Council recognises that a compulsory purchase order can only be made if there is a compelling case in the public interest. The Council considers that a compelling case in the public interest exists in this case.
2. **THE ORDER LAND**

2.1 The Order Land totals [ ] hectares⁴ and comprises all interests in the Site (not otherwise owned by the Developer or the Council) required in order to carry out the Scheme. Table 1 to the Order details the address, title number and registered proprietor of each interest within the Scheme yet to be acquired. Currently [24] interests (excluding highways plots) remain to be acquired and these are identified in the Schedule which accompanies the Order Map at Appendix B of this Statement of Reasons. The Developer continues, with the assistance of the Council, to seek to acquire the remaining interests by agreement and a number of other interests are at agreed sale stage.

2.2 The Site of which the Order Land forms part is situated in the Deptford and New Cross area in the north of the Borough and close to the boundary with the London Borough of Southwark. The Site as a whole presents as a degraded, low quality environment, predominantly industrial in character with industrial estates which are closed off and inward looking. The estates were established in the 1970s/1980s as part of a previous package of economic funding. The Site is set within a wider area which suffers from a significant degree of severance caused by railway lines on wide viaducts creating an environment which discourages pedestrian access and connectivity.

2.3 Current pedestrian access into and out of the Site is limited by a number of constraints including the railway lines, poor pedestrian crossing facilities and no direct access to South Bermondsey Station. Bridgehouse Meadows is a relatively large public open space to the south-east of the Site. This open space is proposed to be enhanced to meet the needs of the Scheme.

2.4 The Millwall Football Club stadium is located in the heart of the Site. The Core Strategy highlights the potential of the football club to form the core of a new location in an area largely devoid of identifiable features such as local shops, community and leisure facilities.

2.5 The Site is characterised as being within Flood Zone 3a of the River Thames floodplain, although in an area shown to be benefiting from existing flood defences to a 1 in 1,000 year standard. Mitigation measures are to be provided as part of the Scheme to address the remote possibility of flood defences failing.

2.6 In terms of transport links, South Bermondsey Station which provides a rail service to London Bridge running approximately every 15 minutes is located immediately adjacent to the Site, although access is currently indirect via Ilderton Road. Ilderton Road also serves as the location for the only local bus route, the number P12 which runs from Brockley Rise to Surrey Quays approximately every 10 minutes. Phase 2 of the East London Line Extension included extending the line from Surrey Quays to Clapham Junction via Peckham. This route opened in December 2012 and trains run approximately every 9 minutes. As part of the works completed in 2012, the foundations for the platform and new station at Surrey Canal Road were put in place. The new station is to be delivered with a financial contribution secured under the terms of the S106 Agreement. The Developer and TfL have agreed that it will be called New Bermondsey Station.

2.7 The Site is large with a total area of 10.74 hectares. For its size, it is comparatively under-utilised. It currently accommodates 400,000 square metres of floor space within a series of existing buildings including:

- Land to the south east of Surrey Canal Road – Excelsior Works;
- Land to the south west of the Surrey Canal Road – including Rollins Street;
- Land to the north of Surrey Canal Road – The Orion Industrial Estate;

⁴ To be completed once Order finalised.
• Land to the South of Stockholm Road;
• Land to the north and west of Bolina Road – including Enterprise Industrial Estate;
• The Lions Centre (Millwall Community Scheme);
• Millwall Football Stadium and surrounding land to the south east and south west.

2.8 Due to the low lying nature of the Site and the fact that the existing buildings are generally low rise, the existing railway lines which run along the north eastern boundaries currently dominate the Site.

2.9 There are a number of waste transfer sites amongst and beyond the railway embankments adjoining the Site. To the north east of the Site lies the South East London Combined Heat and Power facility (SELCHP).

2.10 All buildings within the Order Land are used for light industrial purposes, save for Bridge House within Excelsior Works which is classified as a house in multiple occupation. The light industrial units within the Order Land are presently let to occupational tenants. The Order Land also encompasses the land round the Millwall FC Stadium which is leased to The Millwall Football and Athletic Company (1985) PLC and the land known as the Lion’s Centre, currently leased to the Millwall Community Trust.

2.11 New rights are also required to fulfil certain requirements of the Section 106 Agreement. These affect land owned by Network Rail, London Underground Limited and MFC. The rights include in summary:

2.11.1 Rights to construct, use (in common with others) and maintain a pedestrian and cycle access route from the north west corner of the Site to South Bermondsey Railway Station.

2.11.2 Rights to undertake railway arch and underpass works in relation to railway arches and underpasses that surround the Site (as illustrated on the Order Map) at South Bermondsey Station, Zampa Road, Stockholm Road, Rollins Street, the route to Surrey Quays and Bolina Road.

2.11.3 Rights to carry out works to landscape and thereafter maintain railway embankments adjoining the Site and to carry out habitat creation works on the said land.

2.11.4 Rights to install and maintain conducting media under the railway arch between the South East London Combined Heat and Power facility and the Site to the extent it is required for the installation of the proposed district heating network that is to provide heat and power to the Scheme.

2.11.5 Rights to carrying out and complete works to replace and improve the existing façade of the MFC Stadium, as required by the Section 106 Agreement relating to the outline planning permission (and as to be applied to the Section 73 consent).

2.12 Various rights and covenants also affect the Order Land as identified in Table 2 of the Order Schedule.

2.13 In respect of those Plots where the Council owns the freehold interest, the Schedule includes the acquisition of the leasehold interests and existing rights of statutory undertakers that subsist in such Plots. The Council has had regard to the CPO Guidance in respect of using compulsory purchase powers in such circumstances.

2.14 It is intended that unless acquired by private treaty negotiations, all land including certain existing rights over land and new rights within the Order Land will be acquired by the Council pursuant to the Order. Where landowners have rights affected by the Order, where
appropriate, the Council will consider the grant of equivalent or replacement rights where consistent with the Scheme.

2.15 On [ ] 2016, the Council’s Mayor and Cabinet resolved to use its compulsory purchase powers under s226(1)(a) of the 1990 Act and Section 13 of the 1976 Act to acquire the land, including existing rights over land, and new rights comprised in the Order Land to facilitate the carrying out of the Scheme. Both prior to and subsequent to the Council’s resolution, the Developer with the Council’s assistance has used and continues to use all reasonable efforts to acquire the outstanding interests by negotiation. A summary of the position on negotiations is included in Section 8 below. However, it has become apparent to the Council that it will not be possible to acquire all of the interests required for the Scheme by agreement. The use of compulsory purchase powers is therefore required in order to acquire all the land and rights needed for the Scheme. Efforts to acquire interests by agreement will continue notwithstanding the making of the Order.

2.16 The Scheme is a comprehensive scheme to be delivered across the whole Site and it is considered important that all interests in the Site are secured, including those in the Council’s own land, at the same time as the rest of the Order Land to ensure comprehensive and coherent redevelopment of the Site. Thus, there is a need for the Order to be confirmed in its entirety.
3. **POWERS**

3.1 The Council seeks to purchase compulsorily the Order Land for the purpose of the development, redevelopment or improvement of the land pursuant to Section 226(1)(a) of the 1990 Act. The Council also seeks to acquire new rights pursuant to Section 13 of the 1976 Act.

3.2 Section 226(1)(a) of the 1990 Act provides the power to acquire compulsorily land where an acquiring authority thinks the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement on or in relation to the Order Land. Such power may only be used where the acquiring authority thinks the development, redevelopment or improvement is likely to contribute to the achievement of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the authority’s administrative area (see Section 226(1A) of the 1990 Act).

3.3 The CPO Guidance recognises the use of the Section 226 power as a positive tool to help acquiring authorities to assemble land where this is necessary to implement proposals in their Local Plan or where string planning justification for the use of the power exists and provides guidance to acquiring authorities on the use of the Section 226 power and compulsory purchase powers generally. The Council has had regard to the CPO Guidance in making the Order.

3.4 For the reasons set out in this Statement of Reasons, the Council considers that the acquisition of the Order Land will facilitate the development, redevelopment and improvement of the Order Land and that the redevelopment will achieve an improvement in the environmental, social and economic well-being of the area.

3.5 The Order further seeks the acquisition of new rights pursuant to powers in Section 13 of the 1976 Act, in order to fulfil certain requirements of the Section 106 Agreement. These affect land owned by Network Rail, London Underground Limited and MFC. The rights include in summary:

3.5.1 Rights to construct, use (in common with others) and maintain a pedestrian and cycle access route from the north west corner of the Site to South Bermondsey Railway Station.

3.5.2 Rights to undertake railway arch and underpass works in relation to railway arches and underpasses that surround the Site (as illustrated on the Order Map) at South Bermondsey Station, Zampa Road, Stockholm Road, Rollins Street, the route to Surrey Quays and Bolina Road.

3.5.3 Rights to carry out works to landscape and thereafter maintain railway embankments adjoining the Site and to carry out habitat creation works on the said land.

3.5.4 Rights to install and maintain conducting media under the railway arch between the South East London Combined Heat and Power facility and the Site to the extent it is required for the installation of the proposed district heating network that is to provide heat and power to the Scheme.

3.5.5 Rights to carrying out and complete works to replace and improve the existing façade of the MFC Stadium, as required by the Section 106 Agreement relating to the outline planning permission (and as to be applied to the Section 73 consent).

3.6 The Council considers that acquisition of the Order Land is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of development, redevelopment and improvement so as to secure the wider regeneration of a poor and deprived area of North Lewisham, so contributing to the regeneration of the wider area. The Scheme will deliver a number of key benefits including:

- 2,000 new jobs;
2,400 new homes;
A new station on the East London Line;
2 new bus routes linking the Site to Lewisham and Central London;
Energize, a £40m state-of-the-art regional sports complex;
New cycling and pedestrian routes linking the Site to the wider area;
A new faith and community centre;
A new multi-faith and multicultural resources centre;
A 150 bed hotel and conferencing centre;
New GP facilities with other health services, which may include specialisms in sports injury;
The refurbishment of the park at Bridgehouse Meadows;
A creative/digital quarter;
A new and improved setting for The Den and Millwall Football Club and allowing for an increase in capacity of the Stadium from 20,000 to 26,500;
A new home for the Millwall Community Scheme;
5 new public squares and private gardens for residents;
Improvements to 14 surrounding railway arches and underpasses creating links into the surrounding areas;
Surrounding junction improvements;
Enhanced security and safety across the Site and surrounding areas.

3.7 It is considered that the Scheme will contribute to the promotion or improvement of economic, social and environmental well-being of the area, including in the following ways, taking each in turn:

3.7.1 In terms of economic well-being, the Scheme will deliver:
- The regeneration of a poor and deprived area;
- 1,470 permanent jobs and 700 full-time construction jobs (there are currently 366 jobs on the Site);
- A new Overground station on the East London Line;
- Two new bus routes for the area;
- A new creative/digital quarter;
- A network of new cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site to the surrounding areas;
- A new hotel and enhanced conferencing facilities;
• Space for new business start-ups;

• An overall package of Section 106 contributions by the developer totalling £40 million.

3.7.2 In terms of social well-being, a key part of the Scheme is ‘Energize’, the largest indoor sports complex for community use to be built in London since Crystal Palace in 1964. Energize will promote healthy living and increase the local community’s wellbeing and self-esteem. Alongside sports facilities, Energize will provide a series of outreach programmes from clubs and tenants from the sports centre to encourage participation in sport and provide education on nutrition, fitness and a healthy lifestyle.

3.7.3 In 2014, the OnSide Charity revealed plans to expand their network of Youth Zones to New Bermondsey. The Surrey Canal Sports Foundation (Charity number 1141811) (SCSF) formed a partnership with Onside to incorporate a Youth Zone within the fabric of Energize. The Youth Zone within Energize will have its own dedicated space attracting approximately 3,000 visits by young people every week.

3.7.4 Discussions are currently ongoing between the Greenhouse Sports Charity and the SCSF about a long-term presence within Energize. Greenhouse Sports aim to develop the social, thinking, emotional and physical skills of young people in London’s inner-city communities. During 2014-15 Greenhouse’s coaches worked with almost 8,000 young people across London. Both OnSide and Greenhouse would contribute towards the capital cost of Energize in exchange for access to the facilities.

3.7.5 Lewisham Thunder basketball club, a future occupier, is already on the Site in temporary facilities and is delivering a Hoops4Health programme in 16 local schools. Fusion Table Tennis club are also on the Site in temporary facilities. These facilities attract c. 2,800 people per month. Further social well-being benefits include:

• Enhanced permeability through new streets, paths and cycle routes;

• A new home for the Lewisham’s multi-faith and multicultural resources centre;

• The creation of new faith and community space, which will act as a local meeting place, exhibition space and conduit for social cohesion;

• New health facilities;

• New crèche facilities;

• New public meeting places;

• The relocation of the Lion’s Centre to enhanced facilities in the new sports facility building;

• A safer and more secure environment achieved through increased permeability, footfall, lighting and CCTV which will lead to a reduction in crime.

3.7.6 The SCSF is already working to raise the money to build and run the sports complex and to date has £18.5 million pledged, and a further £5 million request for funds being considered, bring total potential pledges to £23.5 million. The SCSF has been established to ensure that the facilities remain for community use at local authority rates. It will be responsible for encouraging the tenant clubs to run their programmes in the local authority and for increasing sports participation locally. The board members are:
3.7.7 In terms of environmental wellbeing, in addition to the regeneration of an area currently presenting a degraded low quality environment with an environment which discourages pedestrian access and connectivity, the Scheme will deliver the following benefits:

- A refurbished park at Bridgehouse Meadows;
- 5 new public squares;
- High quality new public realm at ground level and high quality private realm at the podium level;
- Extensive roof planting providing new wildlife habitats;
- A connection to SELCHP for heat and power;
- ENVAC underground waste system;
- A new setting for Millwall Football Club;
- A safer and more secure environment achieved through increased permeability, footfall, lighting and CCTV, which will lead to a reduction in crime;
- A new Overground station on the East London Line;
- Two new bus routes for the area;
- Improvements to several road junctions;
- A new network of cycle and pedestrian routes linking the site to the surrounding areas.

3.8 The Regeneration and Equalities Statement (Section 12 and Appendix K) further demonstrates the economic, social and environmental well-being outputs and regeneration benefits of the Scheme.

3.9 The purpose of the Order and the case for compulsory acquisition is addressed in Section 9 of this Statement of Reasons. Details of how the Council has had regard to the European Convention on Human Rights are set out in Section 11.
4. PLANNING FRAMEWORK AND PLANNING POSITION IN RELATION TO THE SCHEME

4.1 The re-development of the Order Land will deliver comprehensive mixed use development in accordance with SSA 3 of the Core Strategy and will also facilitate sustainable development in line with both national, regional and local policy objectives including the Core Strategy the London Plan, the NPPF, Lewisham's Regeneration Strategy: People, Prosperity, Place, and Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 – 2020: ‘Shaping our future’.

4.2 A mix of national, regional and local planning policy objectives have informed the planning process in respect of the Scheme. Relevant planning policies are listed in Appendix F.

4.3 The Development Plan for the area including the Site comprises the London Plan, the Core Strategy, the Lewisham Site Allocations Local Plan June 2013, and the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan November 2014.

4.4 In addition to the statutory development plan, various other documents form part of the overall ‘policy framework’ for the area and are relevant to decision-taking in a planning context. These include, amongst other things, Government Guidance, draft plans and supplementary planning documents.

4.5 The NPPF contains the Government’s guidance for local planning authorities in relation to plan-making and decision-taking.

4.6 The NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development and ‘decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development’ (paragraph 187).

4.7 In order to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. It is confirmed the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions (paragraph 8).

4.8 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF specifically states that ‘housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development’.

4.9 The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore, significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system (paragraph 19).

4.10 The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people (paragraph 56). It is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes (paragraph 57).

4.11 In addition to the Development Plan, various Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) are relevant including the Mayor’s Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance on Housing and the Council’s Residential Development Standards (updated version 2012).

Regional policy

4.12 The London Plan provides the strategic planning policy context for all London Boroughs and in turn provides the regional contextual policy background for the Borough, and a framework for local planning policy. It sets out an integrated social, economic and environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London to 2036. It brings together the geographic and locational aspects of the Mayor’s strategies, including those dealing with Transport, economic development, housing, culture and a range of social issues such as
children and young people. Health inequalities and food. The London Plan seeks to promote
development in the most suitable locations with a preference on the delivery of previously
developed sites, such as the Site. It also supports the aspirations of reducing reliance on the
private car and promoting development in sustainable locations.

4.13 The Site falls within the South East London Sub-Region, whereby policy seeks to encourage
new development that underpins the sub-region’s dynamism and potential, and delivers the
priority for delivering regeneration and transport improvements and links from the capital and
the Thames Gateway. The London Plan encourages the Borough to accommodate
substantial growth for London’s economy and population, whilst optimising the development
of Opportunity Areas and ensuring that housing provision is supported by social and
community infrastructure.

4.14 Key London Plan policies relevant to the regeneration of the Site are:

- Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London;
- Policy 2.13 Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas;
- Policy 2.14 Areas for regeneration;
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments;
- Policy 3.7 Large residential developments;
- Policy 3.19 Sports facilities;
- Policy 4.1 Developing London’s economy;
- Policy 4.6 Support for and enhancement of arts, culture, sport and entertainment
  provision;
- Policy 5.10 Urban greening;
- Policy 6.13 Parking;
- Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods;
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment;
- Policy 7.4 Local character;
- Policy 7.5 Public realm;
- Policy 7.6 Architecture;
- Policy 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings.

4.15 Map 2.4 within the London Plan identifies a series of Opportunity and Intensification Areas
throughout the Greater London area. The Lewisham, Catford and New Cross area is
identified as such an Opportunity Area (Table A1.1, Area 20) with the policy seeking to
ensure that developments:

- optimise residential and non-residential output and densities, provide necessary
  social and other infrastructure to sustain growth, and, where appropriate, contain
  a mix of uses;
contribute towards meeting (or where appropriate, exceeding) the minimum guidelines for housing and/or indicative estimates for employment capacity, tested as appropriate through opportunity area planning frameworks and/or local development frameworks;

realise scope for intensification associated with existing or proposed improvements in public transport accessibility, such as Crossrail, making better use of existing infrastructure and promote inclusive access including cycling and walking;

support wider regeneration (including in particular improvements to environmental quality) and integrate development proposals to the surrounding areas especially areas.

4.16 Map 2.5 within the London Plan identifies a number of Regeneration Areas where Boroughs should, inter alia, identify areas for regeneration and set out policies that bring together regeneration, development and transport proposals with improvements in learning and skills, health, safety, access, employment, environment and housing in locally based plans, strategies and policies.

4.17 Policy 3.3 in the London Plan recognises the requirement for an increase in the supply of homes in London to meet need through provision of at least an annual average of 42,000 net additional homes across London. Table 3.1 identifies a minimum target for Lewisham of 1,385 new homes per annum throughout the period from 2015-2025. Policy 3.3 states Boroughs should seek to achieve and exceed their average housing target.

4.18 Policy 3.4 seeks to optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range taking into account local context and character, design principles and transport capacity.

4.19 Chapter 7 seeks to promote high quality design that inter alia, respects local context; is sustainable in terms of its design and construction; has the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design and addresses security issues.

4.20 Policy 7.1 states that development should be designed so that layout, tenure and mix of uses interfaces with surrounding land and improves peoples access to social and community infrastructure and other facilities/amenities as well as public transport. Design should also contribute to people’s sense of place, safety and security and new building design and the spaces it creates should reinforce/enhance character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of the neighbourhood.

Core Strategy

4.21 The Core Strategy outlines a number of Drivers of Change, which set out the most significant issues expected to impact the Borough up to 2026 including:

Housing provision

The need to ensure provision of affordable housing is reflected through increasing house prices and low household incomes when compared to the London average. The opportunity to provide new housing in a highly developed borough is limited, so reviewing opportunities to better utilise underused employment areas and town centres as housing locations is necessary. This can protect established residential neighbourhoods, particularly conservation areas. The need to provide sustainably designed new housing and ensure existing homes improve energy efficiency is crucial to address climate change issues and improve living conditions.

Growing the Local Economy
Growing the relatively small Borough economy is a priority of the Council and is essential to the creation of a sustainable community. A key priority is the need to provide and strengthen local employment opportunities and enhance employment prospects by improving training opportunities, and accessibility to jobs within and beyond the sub-region. To contribute to economic growth and address deprivation issues, the Council will need to facilitate the strong growth in the number of small businesses, support creative industries, focus on the economic potential of town centres, local shopping areas and small parades (including street and farmers’ markets), and better use of underused employment areas. Identified growth areas include a range of diverse business services, and the creative and food industries.

**Building a sustainable community**

The benefits of new development need to be maximised for all in the community and will be central to addressing and reducing issues related to deprivation in order to improve education, employment and training opportunities, and reduce health inequalities. New development can contribute to both the provision and enhancement of existing services and facilities, where demand for them arises from the new populations. There is also a role to play in creating a sense of place and community through the high quality design of buildings and spaces that are safe and contribute to a healthy environment.

4.22 The Spatial Strategy within the Core Strategy identifies Deptford and New Cross/New Cross Gate as Regeneration and Growth Areas. Spatial Policy 2 provides that the Regeneration and Growth Areas will provide key regeneration and development opportunities. It identifies five strategic sites (four in Deptford/New Cross including the Site) which are to act as a catalyst for regeneration of the area. The Deptford, Deptford Creekside, New Cross/New Cross Gate area is to accommodate 2,300 new homes by 2016 and a further 8,325 new homes by 2026. This is considered to be a prime location for delivering a substantial portion of the identified housing need and required employment floorspace within the Borough.

4.23 Strategic Site Allocation 3 (SSA3) in the Core Strategy identifies the Site for comprehensive mixed use development and sets out specific requirements for a comprehensive phased approach to re-development in line with an approved Masterplan that delivers the following priorities:

- a new ‘destination’ development that capitalises on the opportunities presented by Millwall Stadium and allows for the long term future of the football club including future requirements for stadium improvement and expansion; it should also seek to enhance the existing football and sports facilities, and make these accessible to the public and allow for the long term future of the Millwall Community Scheme;
- provides at least 20% of the built floorspace developed on the site (excluding the Millwall Stadium area) for a mix of business space (B1(c), B2, B8) as appropriate to the site and its wider context;
- creates a sustainable high density residential environment at a density commensurate with the existing public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of the site or the future PTAL achieved through investment in transport infrastructure and services;
- provides for a mix of dwelling types accommodating, subject to an acceptable site layout, scale and massing, up to 2,500 new homes (C3) with a proportion of on-site affordable housing;
- makes provision for the Surrey Canal Road Overground Station (to be known as New Bermondsey Station) which will be located to the south of Surrey Canal Road and a new pedestrian and cycle bridge adjacent to Phase 2 of the East London Line extension;
• provides retail uses to serve local needs that do not adversely impact existing
town centres (A1, A2);
• provides for a mix of restaurant, food and drink uses to serve the site and
immediate neighbourhood;
• enhances Bridgehouse Meadows, and provides appropriate amenity open space
within the development including children's play space to provide health and
recreational opportunities for new residents;
• improves connectivity of the site and locality to the other strategic sites, the rest
of the borough and adjoining sites within the London Borough of Southwark,
through the provision of new pedestrian and cycling facilities and public transport
services to increase permeability and accessibility;
• ensures the design enables the continued functioning of the adjoining Surrey
Canal Road Strategic Industrial Location, including the waste transfer and
processing uses on Surrey Canal Road;
• ensures appropriate noise mitigation against the surrounding railway viaducts;
• take opportunities to use energy generated by SELCHP for district heating or
other suitable sources of decentralised energy;

4.24 SSA 3 goes on to set out the urban design principles required to be key features of any
Masterplan for the site.

4.25 Chapter 9 (paragraph 9.24) of the Core Strategy explains that the Core Strategy is intended
to encourage landowners to bring forward land and buildings for development where
appropriate. Accepting that there may be instances where landowners may be reluctant or
unwilling to bring forward their land, it states that in such circumstances, the Council may
choose to use its compulsory purchase powers to achieve the Core Strategy's wider
regeneration objectives.

The Council’s Regeneration Strategy: People, Prosperity, Place'

4.26 The Council’s Regeneration Strategy defines six priority outcomes to be achieved by 2020,
covering the Strategic Partnership’s ambitions also outlined in the Sustainable Community
Strategy, ‘Shaping our Future’. The aim is to build communities that are:

• Ambitious and achieving – where people are inspired and supported to fulfil their
potential.
• Safer – where people feel safe and live free from crime, antisocial behaviour and
abuse.
• Empowered and responsible – where people are actively involved in their local
area and contribute to supportive communities.
• Clean, green and liveable – where people live in high quality housing and can
care for and enjoy their environment.
• Healthy, active and enjoyable – where people can actively participate in
maintaining and improving their health and well-being.
• Dynamic and prosperous – where people are part of vibrant communities and
town centres, well connected to London and beyond.

The Council’s Asset Management Plan
4.27 The Council’s Asset Management Plan sets out the approach to using property effectively in order to achieve the Council’s objective of making Lewisham the best place in London to live work and learn. It acknowledges the Council’s assets have a key role to play in supporting the Borough’s regeneration aims.

4.28 The above documents should be read in conjunction with each other in order to provide the Site specific and broader context for the proposed redevelopment of the Site and the need for compulsory acquisition of the Order Land.

Planning position in relation to the Site

4.29 On 30 March 2012, the Council granted Outline Planning Permission for the comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of the site for up to 240,000 square metres (GEA) of development as more particularly described in Section 5 of this Statement of Reasons. The Outline Planning Permission was subject to prior completion of the S106 Agreement to regulate a number of aspects of the development and to deliver a number of commitments, again as set out in Section 5.

4.30 The Scheme was considered to comply with the applicable planning framework, although the amount of permitted business space does not meet the requirements of SSA3 in the Core Strategy. It was, however, considered when granting permission that the business space within the Scheme still represents a substantial amount of new accommodation. It includes a business centre (incubation space) and a creative industries hub and (together with other non-residential uses) provides much needed employment opportunities. The parameters established for permitted business space ensure viability and flexibility of use with appropriate floor to ceiling heights and delivery and goods handling arrangements and ensure that this use is capable of functioning in a way that minimises disturbance to occupiers of the permitted residential accommodation, in accordance with SSA3 in the Core Strategy.

4.31 On 18 December 2015, the Council granted the S73 Permission. The S73 Permission authorises revisions to the parameter plans (and associated changes to the Development Specification) approved under the Outline Planning Permission. The effect of the changes is to maintain the overall quantum of development, and within the specified limits on floorspace by use across the site as a whole, but to allow alteration to the configuration of the buildings within the Timber Wharf, Stockholm and Senegal Way plots which will enable much of the sports use to be accommodated in one building at Timber Wharf rather than distributed more widely around the site. This means that the sports provision can be delivered in one phase, running costs are more economical and a seated arena for 3000 spectators can be provided. The S73 Permission is subject to a Section 106 Agreement providing for the obligations in the Original Section 106 Agreement to apply to the development under the S73 Permission.

Regeneration of the Wider Area

4.32 The re-development of the Site should also be considered in the context of the broader regeneration programme for the Deptford/New Cross Area.

4.33 Four of the five Strategic Site Allocations (Convoys Wharf, Surrey Canal Triangle, Oxestalls Road and Plough Way) within the Core Strategy relate to sites in the Deptford/New Cross area and together these four sites are expected to deliver 60% of the Council’s housing target of 13,847 dwellings between 2015 and 2025. These sites are recognised as being of a scale and significance that make them central to the success of the Core Strategy and which will play a crucial role in place making by creating new places and enabling a transformation of the wider area.

4.34 The position in relation to other strategic sites within the Deptford/New Cross area is set out below. The majority of these sites are not hindered by land assembly issues.

Convoys Wharf – (Strategic Site Allocation 2)
4.35 At 16.6 hectares, Convoys Wharf is the single largest development site in the Borough. The site occupies approximately half of the Borough’s river frontage to the Thames. Strategic Site Allocation 2 identifies the site for mixed use development in line with an approved Masterplan.

4.36 A planning application for re-development of the site was called in by the Mayor of London for his own determination. On 10 March 2015, following completion of a Section 106 Agreement, the Mayor granted outline planning permission for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to include:

- up to 3,500 new homes (at least 525 of which are to be affordable);
- shops, restaurants, cafes;
- a hotel;
- public open spaces;
- public transport improvements including a river bus service and new/diverted bus routes;
- 1,840 car parking spaces;
- renovation of the Olympia Building, a Grade II listed warehouse;
- three tall buildings (two at 38 storeys and one at 48 storeys).

**Oxestalls Road (‘The Wharves’) – Strategic Site Allocation 4**

4.37 The Oxestalls Road site extends to approximately 4.5 hectares. The site is in close proximity to the Pepys Estate and lies between Evelyn Street and the Thames river frontage, and between Deptford Park and Convoys Wharf. The site is currently occupied by low quality commercial buildings, storage and open service yards, a scrap metal yard, a petrol filling station, a dwelling-house and a public house. It provides limited commercial opportunities and little in the way of amenity to local residents.

4.38 On 30 March 2012, the Council granted planning permission (part detailed/part outline) for the re-development of the Site to include:

- 905 homes;
- 16,393 square metres non-residential floorspace, including shops/offices/restaurants/cafes/drinking establishments/hot food take aways/non-residential institutions and assembly and leisure uses);
- commercial uses;
- an energy centre;
- improvements to public realm including a water body along the former route of the Grand Surrey Canal;
- improved transport connections.

4.39 The permission was subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

4.40 The planning permission has been implemented. Applications have been submitted and approved under Section 96A of the 1990 Act in respect of non-material amendments to the permission, along with applications to discharge certain pre-commencement conditions.
In May 2015 a part outline/part detailed planning application was submitted for a revised scheme for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to include:

- 1,132 homes;
- 10,413 square metres non-residential floorspace, including shops/offices/restaurants/cafes/drinking establishments/hot food take aways/non-residential institutions and assembly and leisure uses);
- commercial uses;
- an energy centre;
- improvements to public realm including along the former route of the Grand Surrey Canal;
- improved transport connections.

On 29 October 2015, the Council’s SPC resolved to approve the application subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement which remains under negotiation.

Plough Way - (Strategic Site Allocation 5)

The Plough Way site comprises three main areas:

- Cannon Wharf
- Marine Wharf East and West
- Sites on Yeoman Street and Croft Street

The composite site covers 8.22 hectares. It is located in the north-western corner of the Borough adjacent to the border with the London Borough of Southwark.

Cannon Wharf

Planning permission was granted (subject to a Section 106 Agreement) for development of this part of the Plough Way site on 30 March 2012. The scheme comprises:

- 679 new homes (including two tall buildings of 20 and 23 storeys);
- a purpose-built business centre;
- a children’s nursery;
- landscaping along the former route of the Surrey Canal.

Applications under Section 96A of the 1990 Act for non-material amendments to the permission have been submitted to the Council and approved. The development commenced on site in August 2013 and is anticipated to be complete in September 2018. All buildings except the Cannon Business Centre have been demolished and the site has been divided into two sections. The northern section has been separated from the southern section (which accommodates the Business Centre) to enable the Business Centre to continue to operate whilst construction is taking place. Phase 1 of the development, including the new Business Centre has been completed. Construction of further phases of the scheme are underway.

Marine Wharf West
Planning permission was granted for this part of the Plough Way site (subject to a Section 106 Agreement) on 20 September 2011. The scheme includes:

- 532 new homes including 78 units provided as extra care;
- space for shops and businesses (approximately 4,000 square metres);
- landscaping along the 30 metres wide former route of the Surrey Canal to provide a new public park and pedestrian and cycle route providing access from Oxestalls Road through to the Thames.

Applications for non-material amendments under Section 96A of the 1990 Act have been submitted to and approved by the Council. The first two phases including new homes, extra care homes and commercial premises is complete. Construction is underway on the subsequent phases, providing further homes. On 10 March 2015 planning permission was granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement for the erection of 34 residential units and 361 square metres of office floorspace (B1 Use Class) together with associated access, car parking, cycle parking and landscaping at Block K (Phase 7) of the development. The remainder of the development is anticipated to be complete by April 2016.

**Marine Wharf East:**

Planning permission was granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement in July 2014 for this part of the Plough Way site to demolish the existing office building on the site and provide 183 residential dwellings, together with flexible commercial floorspace (A1, A2, A3, B1 and D2 Use Classes). The permission has been implemented.

An application was submitted on 26 February 2015 for demolition of existing office building and redevelopment to provide 225 residential dwellings and 1,045 square metres of flexible commercial floorspace in buildings up to 10 storeys. Planning permission was granted on 13 November 2015, following completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
5. PROPOSALS FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE, INCLUDING THE ORDER LAND

Outline Planning Permission

5.1 The Outline Planning Permission granted permission for the comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of the site for up to 240,000 square metres (GEA) of development comprising:

- Class A1/A2 (Shops and Financial and Professional Services) up to 3,000 square metres;
- Class A3/A4 (Cafes/Restaurants and Drinking Establishments) up to 3,000 square metres;
- Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) up to 300 square metres;
- Class B1 (Business) between 10,000 -15,000 square metres;
- Class C1 (Hotels) up to 10,000 square metres;
- Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) between 150,000 - 190,000 square metres (up to 2,400 homes of different sizes and types);
- Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions) between 400 - 10,000 square metres;
- Class D2 (Leisure and Assembly) between 4,260 - 15,800 square metres,

involving the demolition of all existing buildings on the site with the exception of the Millwall FC Stadium (which is to be retained and its façade upgraded and /or re-clad), Plot Excelsior 2 – Guild House (which is to be retained and extended) and Plot Excelsior 5 – Rollins House (which is to be retained, but not altered or extended as part of the planning application).

5.2 The Outline Planning Permission also encompasses the demolition and replacement of the existing Millwall FC grounds-person's store of approximately 140 square metres, re-profiling of site levels, alterations to Surrey Canal road, the re-alignment of the Bolina Road, new streets and other means of access and circulation, including pedestrian/cycle paths, carriageways and servicing areas, areas for parking for emergency services vehicles and outside broadcast units, external areas of land and soft landscaping and publicly accessible open space, car and coach parking areas and accesses to them, cycle storage and, supporting infrastructure works and facilities including sub-stations, energy centre(s), District Heating Network (DHN) connections to and between each plot and the proposed energy centre and the adjoining South East London Combined Heat and Power (SECHP) plant (to the extent to which they lie within the planning application Boundary) and an ENVAC waste storage and handling system (including DNH and ENVAC connections to plots south of Surrey Canal Road under the carriageway of Surrey Canal Road, as altered).

5.3 The Original S106 Agreement imposes requirements relating to:

- The ability to increase the crowd capacity of The Den to increase from 20,148 to 26,500 should Millwall Football Club secure promotion to the Premier League and require a larger stadium;
- Re-cladding of the Millwall FC stadium;
- Provision of car parking spaces to be used by MFC both on event and non-event days;
- Relocation of Millwall FC memorial garden and grounds keeps store;
• Relocation of Millwall Community Scheme to a replacement facility;
• Re-provision of coach parking spaces to be used by MFC on event days;
• An increase sustainable accessibility to the Stadium by providing the proposed pedestrian link to South Bermondsey Station;
• Facilitation of the provision of the new Surrey Canal Road Overground station (to be known as New Bermondsey station);
• Improved connectivity with the surrounding area for pedestrians and cyclists;
• Provision of two new bus routes and a terminus;
• Delivery of new sports facilities, Energize;
• Delivery of a multi faith centre and community centre;
• Provision of not less than 12% affordable housing (by habitable room);
• Entering into of a CPO Indemnity Agreement with the Council;
• Contribution towards the provision of additional school places in the area;
• Provision of a creative industries hub;
• Installation of ENVAC waste system.

5.4 The business space within the Scheme represents a substantial amount of new accommodation. It includes a business centre (incubation space) and a creative industries hub and (together with other non-residential uses) providing much needed employment opportunities. The parameters established for permitted business space ensure viability and flexibility of use with appropriate floor to ceiling heights and delivery and goods handling arrangements and ensure that this use is capable of functioning in a way that minimises disturbance to occupiers of the permitted residential accommodation, in accordance with SSA 3 in the Core Strategy.

5.5 On 18 December 2015, the Council granted the S73 Permission. The S73 Permission is subject to a Section 106 Agreement that applies the obligations in the Original S106 Agreement to the S73 Permission. The Section 73 Permission authorises revisions to the parameter plans (and associated changes to the Development Specification) approved under the Outline Planning Permission. The changes relate only to Plots Timber Wharf 1 and 2, Stockholm 1 and 2 and Senegal Way 1 and 2. There are no changes to the description of development, and there is no proposed increase to the overall floorspace of the development. The effect of the changes is to maintain the overall quantum of development, and within the specified limits on floorspace by use across the site as a whole, but simply to alter the configuration of the buildings within the Timber Wharf, Stockholm and Senegal Way plots.

5.6 The changes made enable much of the sports use to be accommodated in one building at Timber Wharf rather than distributed more widely around the site. This means that the sports provision can be delivered in one Phase, running costs are more economical and a seated arena for 3000 spectators can be provided.

5.7 The floorspace within the Scheme is proposed to be provided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1/A2</th>
<th>Shops &amp; financial &amp;</th>
<th>3,000 square metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Anticipated Commencement Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1A</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>Mid - 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1B</td>
<td>Excelsior 1-4</td>
<td>Q1 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Timber Wharf 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Mid - 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Stockholm 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Q2 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Senegal 1 &amp; 2 plus Stadium</td>
<td>Q2 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Bolina North 1 &amp; 2 plus Bolina West</td>
<td>Q2 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5A</td>
<td>Bolina East</td>
<td>Q3 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8 It is envisaged that the redevelopment of the Site will take approximately eight years. The phasing of the Scheme is anticipated to generally be from south to north. The current indicative phasing sequence, accelerated by Housing Zone designation, is as follows:

5.9 When developed, the Site will be served by two railway stations, South Bermondsey and a new station at Surrey Canal Road (to be called New Bermondsey station) on the East London Overground line. These will form a transport interchange with the provision of two new bus routes. The main bus interchange will be adjacent to the new station. A network of cycling and pedestrian routes will be provided across the Site.

5.10 The scheme will provide around 2,400 new homes and 50,000 square metres of commercial space with the full range of Class A uses, business space, hotel space, non-residential institutions and assembly and leisure uses. The built development will consist of a series of podiums with residential towers above. The only residential floorspace to come down to ground floor level will be the homes on the southern boundary of the Site.

5.11 Public realm will be substantially improved with improvements to Bridgehouse Meadows, the provision of five new public squares and a 28 metre wide boulevard linking the two railway stations. Private amenity space will be provided at the podium level.

5.12 The Scheme includes major sports facilities, principally focused (under the S73 Permission) in one building and providing the largest sporting facilities constructed in London since Crystal Palace in the 1960s. Interim use sports facilities have been developed in an existing warehouse on site and are currently in use pending delivery of the permanent facility.
5.13 It is proposed that Bolina Road be stopped up and thereafter realigned and treated as an estate road and maintained as part of the new estate. There will be improvement works to several road junctions and twelve locations for bus stop off and on-street parking.

5.14 There will be 1,048 parking spaces on the scheme, all underground or under-croft. Of these 720 will be residential (0.3 per home unit), 318 spaces for non-residential parking which will include twenty-two spaces for a car pool. From these spaces, Millwall Football Club will be allocated 150 underground spaces on match days, 8 on days when conferences are being held, and 40 on a normal day.

5.15 Ten coach parking spaces for match days will be provided above ground to the west of the football stadium. Underground spaces will be provided for broadcasting vehicles when matches are being televised. Entrances to underground parking and service areas are identified on parameter plan ITL835-SK-002.

5.16 The seven Phases of the Scheme are as follows:

**Phase 1A Orion**

5.17 This Phase will consist of circa 6,000 square metres of faith space which will contain the new faith centre and community space including a new home for Lewisham’s multi-faith and multicultural resources centre; the Developer has secured a pre-let for the 6,000 square metres of D1 space. Above this will be two residential towers totalling 19,837 square metres of residential floor space equating to approximately 250 private apartments. One tower will be 10-12 storeys the other 17 – 21 storeys.

5.18 **Appendix G** identifies the land interests still to be acquired for this Phase. These are interests in Unit 11 of the Orion Estate and four individual minor interests that also need to be acquired. The interests are required as the premises to which the land interests relate are to be demolished to enable construction of the new faith centre, community space and residential units within this Phase.

5.19 In addition, it is proposed to acquire mines and minerals reserved in respect of land within this Phase which are likely to be encroached upon by the Scheme, as well as existing rights of statutory undertakers which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.20 New rights are proposed to be acquired in respect of this Phase to enable the landscaping and habitat creation works to be carried out to railway embankments.

**Phase 1B (Excelsior 1-4)**

5.21 Phase 1B consists of six buildings housing circa 1700 square metres of bars, cafes, convenience stores and local retail as well as circa 5700 square metres of space for a creative quarter. It will also provide 19,108 square metres of residential floorspace, comprising approximately 271 apartments.

5.22 The Phase also includes major improvement works to the 7-acre public park, Bridgehouse Meadows, which lies immediately to the south of this Phase.

5.23 **Appendix G** identifies the land interests still to be acquired for this Phase. These comprise interests in units 10 11, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 19 of Excelsior Works, and Bridge House. These units are required as they fall within the footprint of the commercial and residential units to be built in this Phase. In addition, the land occupied by the units is required to deliver better access, permeability, new public realm, underground parking and a major new transport interchange connecting the new station at Surrey Canal Road to the London Overground.

---

5 Note: Appendix G to be included and reflect position regarding remaining interests at time CPO made
5.24 In addition, it is proposed to acquire mines and minerals reserved in respect of land within this Phase which are likely to be encroached upon by the Scheme, as well as existing rights of statutory undertakers which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

**Phase 2 (Timber Wharf 1 and 2)**

5.25 Phase 2 will house a 19700 square metre building containing 8560 square metres of sports space and 3230 square metres of commercial space contained within one building. The Developer has secured pre-lets for the building, to be called Energize. The complex will house four floors of sports facilities as follows:

- A multi-purpose 3000 seat arena that can be used for regional and national competitions in sports such as Basketball, Netball, Table Tennis, Amateur Boxing and Handball.
- An indoor 3G Football pitch that will be made available to Millwall Community Scheme (negotiations with MCS regarding surrender of the lease on their existing premises and relocation to the new facility are currently ongoing) and which will divide into 5-a-side pitches for hire to the local leisure market.
- A third arena will be sub divided into areas for Table Tennis, Gymnastics and a multi-use sports area.
- A fourth arena will house a 6-lane swimming pool and learner pool, a 150-station gym and a home for the London Amateur Boxing Association and two local boxing clubs.

5.26 Elsewhere in the sports building, a large climbing/bouldering area will be provided, together with changing and showering facilities, classrooms, offices, cafes and sports related retail space and 3020 square metres for Onside, a new ‘Youth Zone’

5.27 The rest of the buildings in Phase 2 will contain 20,497 square metres of residential floorspace from ground level up to 17 storeys at the highest point. This will accommodate approximately 271 apartments.

5.28 Save as referred to in paragraphs 5.28 and 5.29, all the land in this Phase is already owned by the Developer.

5.29 In addition it is proposed to acquire existing rights of statutory undertakers in respect of this Phase which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.30 There is also a parcel of land along the western boundary of the Phase to be acquired from Network Rail and some unregistered land within this Phase which is of unknown ownership and is also included in the Order.

5.31 New rights are proposed to be acquired in respect of this Phase to enable the landscaping and habitat creation works to be carried out to railway embankments.

**Phase 3 (Stockholm 1 and 2)**

5.32 At ground floor level within Phase 3, there will be bars, cafes, restaurants and local retail facilities (circa 2035 sq. m), a 33 metre pool scuba diving centre (circa 5450 square metres) and office space (circa 1350 square metres). At upper floor level there will be 34,298 square metres of residential space accommodating approximately 486 apartments.

5.33 The building on the west side of this Phase has two towers, one of 23 storeys, one of 13 - 14 storeys. Smaller blocks of 3 – 4 storeys separate these towers, whilst the building on the east side has a residential tower rising to 23 storeys.

5.34 Save as referred to in paragraphs 5.35 and 5.36, all land interests in this Phase are already owned by the Developer.
5.35 There is a parcel of land along the western boundary of the Phase to be acquired from Network Rail. In addition it is proposed to acquire existing rights of statutory undertakers in respect of this Phase which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.36 New rights are proposed to be acquired in respect of this Phase to enable the landscaping and habitat creation works to be carried out to railway embankments.

Phase 4 (Senegal 1 and 2, plus Stadium)

5.37 Phase 4 will provide 878 square metres of retail, cafes and bars, 2311 square metres of start-up business space, a 150-bed hotel and 12,221 square metres of residential floorspace. In total this phase includes approximately 172 apartments.

5.38 The hotel will rise to 11 – 12 storeys with one floor of cafes/bars, two floors for start-up businesses and two floors of residential accommodation. The hotel will have associated catering and conference facilities.

5.39 Apart from a small element of retail/cafes on the ground floor, the building on the east of this Phase will contain residential space and will rise to 9 and then 13 storeys.

5.40 Appendix G identifies the land interests still to be acquired for this Phase. The Millwall Football Club leasehold of the land surrounding (but not including) the Stadium is required in order to deliver all development in this Phase, including the residential, commercial and hotel floorspace as well as new public realm including Stadium Avenue, a major new boulevard running alongside the football club. New rights will also be required in order to carry out the works to improve the Stadium façade.

5.41 It is also proposed to acquire existing rights of statutory undertakers in respect of this Phase which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.42 There is also a parcel of land along the western boundary of this Phase to be acquired from Network Rail and some unregistered land within this Phase which is of unknown ownership and is also included in the Order.

5.43 New rights are proposed to be acquired in respect of this Phase to enable the landscaping and habitat creation works to be carried out to railway embankments.

Phase 5 (Bolina North 1 and 2 and Bolina West)

5.44 Phase 5 will comprise predominantly residential floorspace in 3 blocks/4 towers (56,212 square metres), which will accommodate approximately 800 apartments. In addition, circa 400 square metres will be provided for crèche facilities with circa 1400 square metres for bars, restaurants, cafes and convenience shops. The building on the west side of this Phase consists of two towers of 21 and 13 storeys with a podium of 7 storeys joining them. The clusters in the north of the Phase rise to 18, 22 and 26 storeys.

5.45 Appendix G identifies the land interests still to be acquired for this Phase. These comprise Units [2, 3, 28, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38 and 39] Enterprise Industrial Estate. These properties are required to be demolished to make way for the residential and commercial space to be built in this Phase. In addition, the land occupied by the units is required to create new public realm and a new access to South Bermondsey station.

5.46 There is a parcel of land along the western boundary of this Phase to be acquired from Network Rail. In addition, it is proposed to acquire mines and minerals reserved in respect of land within this Phase which are likely to be encroached upon by the Scheme, as well as existing rights of statutory undertakers which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.47 New rights are proposed to be acquired in respect of this Phase to enable the landscaping and habitat creation works to be carried out to railway embankments. New rights are also proposed to be acquired to provide the access route to South Bermondsey station.
Phase 5A (Bolina East)

5.48 This Phase will accommodate a health centre on the first 2 floors amounting to approximately 3663 square metres. It is envisaged that the health centre will not only include doctors and dentists, but will also administer care in the community and provide specialisms in sports medicine including diagnostics, day surgery and rehabilitation including physiotherapy.

5.49 The upper floors will accommodate 17,904 square metres of residential space providing approximately 253 apartments grouped in 3 towers of 10, 13 and 17 storeys.

5.50 Appendix G identifies the land interests still to be acquired for this Phase. The land currently occupied by Millwall Community Scheme is required in order to deliver all the development in this Phase.

5.51 It is also proposed to acquire existing rights of statutory undertakers in respect of this Phase which will need to be interfered with as a result of the Scheme.

5.52 New rights are proposed to be acquired in respect of this Phase to enable the landscaping and habitat creation works to be carried out to railway embankments.
6. **DELIVERY**

6.1 The Developer has been assembling the Site over the last ten years, to-date through private treaty using their own equity with c.13% funded by bank debt. The Developer now has a total of 79 tenancies across their ownership within the Site. There are 85 tenancies in total with 3 tenancies ‘at will’, 65 tenancies outside the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954, 2 two inside the 1954 Act, although both have expired and the tenants are holding over and 14 assured shorthold tenancies. The Developer is in a position to deliver vacant possession across its ownership within 6 months by exercising landlord break clauses which will be triggered by the on-going development schedule and, subject to acquiring the remainder of the land required for the Scheme and to reserved matters/discharge of conditions, is in a position to commence construction in early course.

6.2 Since the Outline Planning Permission was granted, the Developer has concentrated on completing the land assembly exercise and developing a detailed delivery strategy with major sustainable non-residential occupiers for Phases 1A, 1B and 2 and securing Housing Zone designation so enabling delivery of the Scheme to be accelerated.

6.3 On 19 April 2013, planning permission was granted under reference DC/13/82738 for provision of office accommodation and a presentation suite at Guild House within the Site. This facility has been constructed at a cost to the Developer of £1 million. The accommodation is now the Developer’s headquarters for the Scheme where work is in preparation for the preliminary works, launches, commencement on-Site and delivery of the first three Phases of the Scheme.

6.4 Temporary planning permission was granted on 12 September 2013 under reference DC/13/82738 to provide temporary church facilities. Hillsong Church has entered into a four year lease with the Developer and has moved into the temporary facilities. The Church intends to grow its congregation in the area and work with the Developer to deliver a new permanent faith facility within the Scheme. The temporary facilities are understood to attract 6,000 visits per month.

6.5 Similarly, temporary planning permission was granted on 19 September 2013 under reference DC/13/83681 to enable the Surrey Canal Sports Foundation (SCSF), the independent charitable trust which will oversee and run the new sports complex, to permit use of space on the Site and rent-free, to Lewisham Thunder Basketball Club and Fusion Table Tennis Club. The facilities provide changing rooms, meeting rooms, classrooms and offices as well as 500 seats for spectators. Both clubs are currently and successfully operating out of the temporary space. The temporary facilities on-site attract c. 2,800 people per month and the Clubs will become core occupiers in Phase 2 of the Scheme.

6.6 The SCSF date has £18.5 million pledged, and a further £5 million request for funds being considered, bringing total potential pledges to £23.5 million. This phase has been accelerated by the Housing Zone designation and the detailed design and planning for this phase will commence when the Housing Zone agreement is completed with the GLA.

6.7 In February 2015 the Scheme was one of the first schemes to be awarded Housing Zone status by the Mayor of London. Housing Zone status has been awarded to areas identified as key opportunity sites, to maximise development, fast track homes and deliver much needed infrastructure to boost development. As one of the first Housing Zones, the Scheme is recognised as a key development in London and it is one of the few regeneration projects that has the capacity to deliver homes for Londoners, faster. The loan funding secured as a result of Housing Zone status will be applied to key transport links which will not only provide significant benefit to those already living in the area but will also enable Phases 1A and 2 to proceed at the same time, rather than consecutively, therefore accelerating delivery of 532 new homes. A programme of regular monitoring meetings has been agreed between the GLA, the Developer and the Council to enable accelerated delivery.

6.8 The Developer has to-date incurred significant capital expenditure in acquiring land within the Site, as well as securing planning permission and undertaking preparation for
commencement of the Scheme. The process to appoint architects for Phase 1A has commenced and interviews of shortlisted practices took place at the end of April 2014. An appointment is expected once the Housing Zone agreement is completed with the GLA, with reserved matters applications being submitted in 2016.

6.9 Meetings have taken place with Transport for London (TfL) in relation to the design and delivery of the new station on the East London Line at Surrey Canal Road (to be known as New Bermondsey Overground station) which the Developer is contributing £10 million to under the terms of the S106 Agreement. A programme of regular meetings has now been agreed between TfL, the Developer and the Council to develop the design for the station and the programme for delivery. The appointment of contractors and a programme of works will be developed once the Housing Zone agreement has been completed with the GLA.

6.10 The Scheme is proposed to be delivered in Phases over a period of time. The Developer intends to retain the freehold interest in the Site and ensure control over the quality of build, delivery, public realm and place making. The Developer has advised that there is strong interest for the residential in Phase 1A from the large national house builders/developers and Private Rented developers and that it is in detailed discussions with several interested parties to deliver the 261 units of residential on this Phase, and the commercial space, as per the specification defined in the pre-let to Hillsong church. Under the terms of the Housing Zone designation by the GLA, Phases 1A and 2 will be delivered together to accelerate housing delivery.

No impediments to delivery

6.11 The Council has had regard to the requirements of the CPO Guidance generally and Section 1 or Tier 2 in particular with regard to Section 226 Orders. This includes whether the purpose of acquisition fits in with the adopted planning framework, the extent to which the purpose will contribute to the achievement of the stated well-being objectives, that the necessary resources, including funding, are likely to be available to achieve the Order's purpose within a reasonable timescale, that the scheme is unlikely to be blocked by any other physical and legal impediments and whether the purposes for which the land is to be acquired might be achieved by other means, including the appropriateness of any alternative proposals put forward by the owners of the land others, or examining alternative locations for the purpose for which the land is being acquired.

6.12 The Developer has confirmed that Site investigations undertaken to date have not revealed any physical factors which would impede development.

6.13 There are no "special kinds of land" within the Order Land, such as common land, open space or allotments.

6.14 There is some operational land of statutory undertakers within the Order Land. All statutory undertakers have been identified so far as possible and discussions are progressing with them. There are electricity substations and also leasehold interests that encompass telecommunication apparatus and masts operated by electronic communications code operators. It is hoped that agreement will be reached in all cases.

6.15 There are rights of light in favour of neighbouring properties which will be interfered with by buildings constructed under the Scheme on land owned by the Developer. These have been addressed by the transfer of the Developer's land to the Council for planning purposes and the grant of a lease back (with an option to purchase the freehold) by the Council to the Developer, thus engaging Section 237 of the 1990 Act which authorises interference with such rights where done in accordance with planning permission, subject to the payment of compensation.

6.16 In conjunction with the Council, the Developer has spent more than 10 years shaping and facilitating the comprehensive regeneration of the Site. During this time, the Developer has acquired by private treaty the majority of property interests required to assemble the Site and has secured the Outline Planning Permission and S73 Permission for the Scheme which will
deliver significant and comprehensive regeneration to this deprived area in London. In doing so, the Developer has incurred significant capital expenditure in acquisition, design, planning and consultants’/advisors’ costs and has demonstrated a long term outlook and how serious it is about ensuring that the Scheme is brought forward.

6.17 In demonstrating its commitment, the Developer provided detailed information regarding deliverability of the Scheme, including as to viability and the funding strategy. The Developer appointed GL Hearn to bring the necessary detail together. The Council appointed PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP (PWC) to provide financial and real estate due diligence and to review the GL Hearn report and additional information provided by the Developer/GL Hearn.

6.18 The work carried out by GL Hearn included detailed, bottom up, appraisals using industry standard software to assess the viability and deliverability of the Developer’s intended delivery strategy using the current planning permission and market cost and revenue assumptions. PwC considered those cost and revenue inputs to be reasonable and supported by market benchmarks. A review of the outputs and funding assumptions made enabled PWC to conclude that the Developer’s intended delivery strategy is appropriate and that the development is viable with a reasonable prospect of being delivered in line with Developer’s proposals.

6.19 The Developer proposes to adopt a Master Developer Strategy (MDS) approach to advance the Scheme. Under the MDS, the Developer will dispose of individual development plots/phases (by way of development agreements with house builders) in an ordered manner over the development period. From this, the Developer will retain the residual land value from the sale and, wherever possible, retain the commercial interests in any sub-development to drive long-term revenue to the organisation. There is strong developer demand for residential development opportunities in this part of London, particularly of the size of development that each phase represents and the price point of the residential units.

6.20 Under the proposed strategy, the Developer will maintain responsibility for the delivery of the Community Sports Facility (Energize) in Phase 2, the new Overground station on the East London Line, the transport interchange to be provided in Phase 1B and the urban/public realm. In addition, the Developer will retain design control across the whole development and retain the commercial property in each phase.

6.21 The MDS approach will significantly reduce the funding requirements placed on the Developer. With an overall programme of just over 10 years, the majority of costs and risks for the development of individual plots/phases will be passed to sub-developers who are likely to be national house builders. Whilst the MDS approach will allow the Developer to offset much of the delivery risk, at the same time the Developer will retain overall control to ensure that a comprehensive scheme and quality shared places/public realm can be delivered. All are considered important public benefits that underpin the case for the Order and facilitate the much-needed housing and policy ambition for comprehensive redevelopment in the area.

6.22 PWC agree that a MDS approach is a recognised commercial approach for large, complex, multifaceted schemes. There are a number of examples of this delivery route being employed elsewhere, including the Olympic Park in Stratford. PWC also advise that the transfer of construction and residential market risk to a specialist sub-developer helps to dissipate the risk of delivery for large regeneration schemes.

6.23 The GL Hearn appraisal model uses current market assumptions about a range of variable factors which include the cost of finance and the attractiveness of the MDS approach and potential returns. Within their appraisal, GL Hearn set out their assumptions regarding the absorption rate of residential sales into the market place, build costs and sales receipts. DBK (a recognised project management, cost management and building consultancy with experience of large scale developments) provided the build cost advice, whilst sales values are based on GL Hearn’s own research.
6.24 PWC reviewed the modelling developed by GL Hearn and consider:

- Profit on costs for adopting an MDS approach for Renewal demonstrate acceptable returns to a commercial developer for taking the MD role and initiating a complex development such as the Scheme.
- The costs and returns to a sub-developer as modelled are in line with expectations and acceptable to commercial house builders for serviced plots with the benefit of outline planning consent and in light of the demand for additional housing in this area.
- The build cost estimates are supported by benchmarks (with savings against these costs potentially achievable by specialist house builders).
- Sales values (as at a June 2015 base) on a unit basis are considered reasonable.

6.25 The Council considers that the information available shows the Scheme is viable and is likely to be delivered on a reasonable time-scale. This conclusion is further augmented by a number of legal agreements which it is considered further support the likelihood of delivery of the Scheme:

- The Conditional Land Sale Agreement between the Council and Renewal dated 20th December 2013 relating to the Council’s freehold interest in the land around the Stadium and the Lions Centre. The sale is conditional upon Renewal entering into agreements with MFC and MCS or the interests being acquired by CPO if a private treaty agreement cannot be reached. The Agreement also includes provision for the transfer of the land back to the Council if the comprehensive scheme has not been commenced within 4 years of the transfer of the Council's interest to Renewal. There is therefore an incentive on Renewal to commence the Scheme as soon as is reasonably practicable within the 4 year period.
- The Section 106 Agreements entered into in March 2012 and December 2015. The requirements of the Agreements are summarised elsewhere in this Report, but it is noteworthy that financial commitments early on in the Scheme incentivise the development of later phases if returns are to be realised. Given the upfront costs of the development, including major Section 106 contributions, the returns on the Scheme do not start to be realised until Phase 3 of the development which also supports the comprehensive development.
- The CPO Indemnity Agreement entered into on 20th December 2013 which provides for Renewal to fund the cost of the land acquisition process (including by CPO) and for the subsequent transfer to Renewal of the land to complete the land assembly.
- The GLA Housing Zone agreement entered into on [ ] which provides Renewal with £20 million of repayable loan funding. The Agreement binds Renewal to completing the scheme and accelerates delivery of the new station on the East London Line, two new bus routes and improvements to existing walking and cycling routes and enables development of the first two phases of development (1A and 2) to proceed ahead of schedule delivering 532 homes earlier.

6.26 In terms of funding for the Scheme, the programme cash flows, as modelled, indicate that, if sunk costs are ignored, a peak debt funding requirement is reached in year 3 with the Scheme almost at break even in year 4 and in surplus from year 5 onwards. If sunk costs are included the peak debt is reached in year 3 and a surplus is reached from year 7 onwards. PWC have confirmed that they consider that the appraisals presented by GL Hearn have been properly considered and reflect the Developer’s development intentions.

6.27 The Developer has set up a project company/special purpose vehicle as the delivery vehicle for the Scheme – this is a widely recognised approach to large scale project/programme
delivery. The project company is not established with sufficient resources to deliver the scheme utilising its own funds and the intention is that funding for the project would be provided by the shareholders of the Developer.

6.28 The Developer is a company incorporated in the Isle of Man. It is a wholly owned subsidiary of Renewal Holdings Ltd (also registered in the Isle of Man) which in turn is owned on a 50/50 basis by Incorporated Holdings Ltd (IHL) (registered in the Isle of Man) and Independent Advisors Incorporated (registered in the British Virgin Isles). It is these companies who it is intended will provide the required funding for the development. Funding for the project to date has been provided almost entirely by shareholders, with only circa 13% funded by bank debt provided by RBS.

6.29 The debt provided by the shareholders is unsecured with no fixed repayment date and has 10% annual interest charges applied to the debt – the interest charges are included in the appraisal modelling. The implication therefore is that the shareholders will only see their principal investment and interest returned as the scheme is delivered. The fact they have significant investment in the project already suggests that commercially further investment is highly likely. Indeed, the Developer and the shareholders have entered into a development and funding agreement providing for further funding for the scheme. Whilst this is subject to the appraisal at the time being able to demonstrate a 10% development profit. The sensitivity analysis carried out by GL Hearn identifies that property prices would need to fall by 13% across the scheme as a whole for this level of profit not to be delivered. PWC note that such a fall in house prices is not unprecedented but would represent a significant and unusual market adjustment not currently forecast by any credible commentators. Further, a collapse in the housing market would not occur in isolation and that the impact on any appraisal would be mitigated by other market adjustments such as a fall in build costs which they would anticipate during a property recession. The Developer, in common with other master developers, would have the option to pause the development until such time as house prices recovered.

6.30 Further, if for any reason the shareholders failed to provide the funding, there are alternative funding strategies for the project. An assembled site, with Outline Planning Permission/S73 Permission for the comprehensive Scheme, and the MDS delivery approach is considered to make the Scheme generally bankable/fundable. If the Developer’s shareholders decided not to fund the scheme, it would be expected that traditional debt funding would be available to the Developer to satisfy the maximum deficit arising during the course of the project. Given the residual value of the Site post completion of the land assembly exercise, such debt funding could be secured at favourable rates (on the basis of the Developer’s shareholders fully subordinating their equity investment to date). Therefore assessing the scheme on a non-developer specific basis, it would be expected that the maximum deficit could be funded by any developer notwithstanding its financial standing or covenant strength.

6.31 In the Council’s view, if the comprehensive redevelopment is to come forward on a reasonable time-scale, this is only likely to occur if the Site is assembled with the assistance of CPO powers.

**Could the Order purpose be achieved by other means?**

6.32 Consideration has been given to whether the purpose for which land and rights are proposed to be acquired could reasonably be achieved by other means, including by other existing landowners, within a reasonable timescale. The purpose of the acquisition is to enable comprehensive redevelopment of the Order Land in accordance with the adopted planning policy framework. The Outline Planning Permission and S73 Permission envisage comprehensive redevelopment in general accordance with those policies. Given that the Developer has itself applied for and obtained planning permission and owns or controls the majority of the interests in the Site, the Developer is the obvious partner to bring forward the Scheme. It is considered that separate development of other parcels would be likely to result in piecemeal development, risk the non-achievement of comprehensive development of the Site and risk substantial delays in the Scheme coming forward.
Despite significant land assembly being undertaken by the Developer, land ownership across the Site is still fragmented. In order to achieve the public benefits of the Scheme and the ambition of comprehensive development, the land assembly needs to be complete. There is little prospect of this occurring without the Order.

Nor could the re-development take place elsewhere. The Site is unique in terms of size, scale and location of development which is reflected in being one of only five sites allocated in the Core Strategy as a Strategic Site. These sites have been identified due to their potential to collectively transform the physical environment and achieve place making objectives by delivering a comprehensive range of regeneration outcomes is the Borough’s most deprived areas. Whilst there are other sites within the Borough which will contribute to the delivery of the Core Strategy, none deliver the range of benefits of the strategic sites. Collectively, the four strategic sites in Deptford/New Cross are expected to deliver 60% of the Council’s ten year housing target in addition to a range of employment opportunities and infrastructure, accessibility and public realm improvements. These planning objectives cannot be realised from any alternative site for this scale of major regeneration.

It is therefore considered that the Scheme, for which planning permission, has been granted is viable, that funding will be in place to enable implementation of the Order if confirmed and that there is a reasonable prospect that the Scheme will be delivered on a reasonable timescale. Consequently, if the Order is confirmed the Council is confident that there will be no impediments to implementation.
7. CONSULTATION

7.1 The Council has undertaken a series of consultation exercises in respect of the regeneration and planning policies applicable to the Site and surrounding area. In turn the Developer has carried out consultation in respect of the specific Scheme proposals and there has been statutory consultation on the planning applications. There has thus been extensive consultation over a number of years both in respect of the policies and principles underpinning the Scheme through to detailed proposals.

7.2 Extensive consultation was undertaken by the Developer throughout the pre-application consultation process and meetings took place with a wide range of local groups and all relevant stakeholders. Up until the outline planning application was submitted in February 2011 overall the Developer promoted the scheme to 76,074 community members, and spoke to approximately 4,825 people directly.

7.3 Since February 2011 the Developer has continued to respond to all enquiries from the local community (including residents, local businesses and MFC supporters). The Developer has developed relationships with both local (South London Press, Southwark News, New Shopper and Lions Live radio show) and regional press (Evening Standard) who publish stories on the Scheme when there is a significant development. The Developer has launched a newsletter, the first issue of which was published in Spring 2015 and circulated to 1,500 neighbouring properties and published online. Since the granting of the Outline Planning Consent the Developer has received weekly enquiries from local residents and businesses. The Developer responds to every enquiry within 48 hours and records of all correspondence are kept.

7.4 In February 2015 the Scheme was launched as New Bermondsey to coincide with the Mayor of London’s announcement regarding Housing Zone designation. The launch included new branding, the newsletter and a new website www.newbermondsey.com

7.5 Up until submission of the outline planning application, consultation activities consisted of pre application meetings with elected Members, MPs, London Assembly Members, the Mayor and Cabinet and representatives from local organisations including the Police, Lewisham College, Goldsmiths College, local schools, MFC, the MCS and Lewisham Hospital.

7.6 Specific consultation activities include:

Lewisham People’s Day: July 2010
The Scheme was launched to the public at Lewisham People’s Day on the 10th July 2010. People’s Day is Lewisham’s longest running community festival attracting over 30,000 people, with the majority attending from the north of the Borough.

Lewington Centre exhibition
Following People’s Day, the Developer held a more detailed three day exhibition at the Lewington Centre on the Silwood Estate immediately to the north of the Site from Sunday 25th to Tuesday 27th July 2010.

Scotney Hall exhibition
A further exhibition was held on Friday 1st and Saturday 2nd October 2010 at Scotney Hall on the Winslade Estate immediately to the south of the Site in order to engage with those were not able to attend either People’s Day or the Lewington Centre exhibition because they were away during the summer.

Young People
The Developer identified the importance of speaking with as many young people as possible given the number of young people in the Surrey Canal area is very high (27.4% of the local population are aged between 15-25 compared with 11.5% across London).
In partnership with the Deptford X visual arts festival, the Developer commissioned the ‘A Load of Rubbish’ project. The project enabled Turner Prize nominated artist Mark Titchner to run workshops with Deptford Green students to create three pieces of artwork which were displayed on the three refuse trucks which serve North Lewisham.

The Developer presented to the Council’s Young Mayor and Cabinet and their feedback had a direct impact on development of the Scheme. For example the type of sports facilities included; the Young Mayor and Cabinet’s creative response to the proposals led to the inclusion of a climbing wall in the proposals and led to the consideration of more unusual sports, such as a diving centre. Following initial presentation to the group, the Developer kept in close contact with them, invited them to events and kept them updated with the plans for the Emerging Scheme as they developed.

The Developer presented to the Ministry of Youth group who are based immediately to the south of the Surrey Canal area on the Winslade Estate and they have worked closely with the Ministry of Youth on the proposals for an enhanced community park at Bridgehouse Meadows.

Faith Leaders and Groups
The Developer spoke to Faith Leaders and Groups through surveys, and one to one meetings with Faith Leaders, the Faith Officer at the London Borough of University and Dr Chris Hewson from the University of Manchester who is conducting research into multi-faith spaces.

Overall the Developer spoke to over 100 Faith & Community organisations and appointed Michael Wakelin, former Head of Religion and Diversity at the BBC and current Director of Coexist Programmes at Cambridge University, to assist with finding suitable occupiers for phase 1 of the scheme. Mr Wakelin assisted the Developer with shortlisting six potential Faith occupiers, developing their proposals with them, understanding their organisations, and commercially testing their requirements. From those six organisations, the Developer selected to work with the Pentecostal Church, Hillsong. Hillsong are now operating from interim facilities on site at Stockholm Road pending development of Phase 1A. The interim facilities are understood to attract circa 6,000 visits per month.

Millwall Football Club
The Developer engaged with MFC fans, staff and management through fans forums, meetings at the two public exhibitions, advertisements in match day programmes and an interview on the Lions Live (MFC fans) radio show on 18th November 2010. Overall the Developer spoke directly to 975 MFC fans.

Bridgehouse Meadow workshop
A CABE Spaceshaper workshop was held with local residents and stakeholders in October 2010 to investigate the current use and potential of the space at Bridgehouse Meadows which will inform the design team’s approach to creating a revitalised community park.

S73 application consultation

The outline application was publicised and consulted upon in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010. In addition, the application was advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. Internal consultations were carried out with relevant departments at the Council. The required external consultations were also undertaken.

Bridgehouse Meadow workshop
A CABE Spaceshaper workshop was held with local residents and stakeholders in October 2010 to investigate the current use and potential of the space at Bridgehouse Meadows which will inform the design team’s approach to creating a revitalised community park.

S73 application consultation

The S73 application was publicised and consulted upon in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010. In addition, the application was advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)
Regulations 2011. Internal consultations were carried out with relevant departments at the Council. The required external consultations were also undertaken.

7.9 The Developer consulted widely with Sport England and the various National Governing Bodies of sport, including the English Table Tennis Association, the British Amateur Boxing Association, England Netball, the Amateur Swimming Association, Basketball England and British Gymnastics who all supported the proposals for condensing the sports facilities from four buildings into one.

7.10 Details of the S73 Application were uploaded to surreycanal.com.

7.11 On 22nd May 2013 MCS was updated on the S73 application and the Scheme.

7.12 The Council sent out 362 letters to residents and business in the surrounding area. In addition, ten site notices were displayed within the vicinity of the Site on the 23rd October 2013 and Ward Councillors were notified.

7.13 Two local representations were received in response to the communication sent out. One letter of support from a property on Ilderton Road and one letter of objection from solicitors acting on behalf of MFC.

7.14 The Developer owns all the land affected by the changes proposed in the S73 Permission. All tenants on these plots have been kept informed of the progress of the master plan and their leases are structured accordingly.

Online

7.15 Since the Outline Planning Permission was granted, the Developer has launched the New Bermondsey website (www.newbermondsey.com) which includes statements from the Developer and all planning application documents submitted to the Council. A stand-alone website has been developed for the SCSF (www.surreycanalsportsfoundation.org.uk). In February 2012 the New Bermondsey website was launched to coincide with the Mayor of London’s designation of New Bermondsey as a Housing Zone, with all traffic from the former www.surreycanal.com website re-directing to the New Bermondsey website.
8. **ATTEMPTS TO ACQUIRE BY AGREEMENT**

8.1 Wherever practicable, the Developer has sought to acquire properties by agreement. The Council has provided support to the Developer in the acquisition process and remains fully aware of the requirements of the CPO Guidance and the intention that CPO should be a matter of last resort.

8.2 At the time of preparation of this Statement of Reasons, some [24] interests (excluding highways land) required for the Scheme remain to be acquired within the Site. The Developer continues to seek to acquire interests by agreement and a number of other interests are at an agreed sale stage.

8.3 The Developer has corresponded extensively with landowners regarding the acquisition of their interests. In such correspondence, the Developer has provided contact details for relevant officers at the Council encouraging the landowner to contact the Council should they wish to do so. Further, in June 2014 the Council wrote to those parties with remaining land interests in the Site who have not yet reached a negotiated settlement with the Developer for the acquisition of their interest. The letter encouraged landowners to negotiate with the Developer, but also stated that the Council remained willing to treat directly with them for the acquisition of their interest should they not wish to negotiate with the Developer. The Council again wrote to landowners on 11th December 2015, explaining that Officers were in the course of preparing a report to the Council’s Mayor and Cabinet to consider whether a CPO should be made. The letter again invited negotiations for the acquisition of the interests by private treaty and stated the Council’s and the Developer’s intention that in the event of a CPO being made, the process should run in parallel with continued negotiations, the clear preference being acquisition by agreement and not the use of CPO powers. The Council again wrote to landowners on 19 January 2016 advising of Officers intention to submit a report to Mayor and Cabinet in relation to the CPO resolution.

8.4 The Developer has kept all of the existing tenants informed about progress with the Scheme and the likely timescales for the relevant Phase that their unit is located in, to ensure that they can manage their business and property matters. A letter was sent to all tenants on informing them of the relocation strategy and that Kalmars Commercial Agents had been appointed to assist tenants with finding new accommodation. New tenants are advised of the planned regeneration of the area and the estimated timeline for each of the proposed Phases before entering into their leases, and all new leases have the appropriate breaks to ensure that the Developer can obtain vacant possession with 6 months’ notice.

8.5 The Developer has actively assisted any tenants who have required advice on relocation. The Developer has also identified vacant industrial space within ½ mile of the Site that is equal to the current occupied space within the red line boundary of the Scheme and which may provide suitable alternative accommodation. The Developer is aware that one current tenant at unit 24 Orion Business Centre, has signed a new lease with the landlord of the neighbouring Surrey Canal Trade Park following an introduction by the Developer. The tenant at unit 24 is expecting to move to the Surrey Canal Trade Park in March 2016.

8.6 In May 2015, the Developer appointed Kalmars Commercial to assist current commercial tenants with advice on relocation and available alternative commercial properties on the market. GL Hearn, who have been appointed jointly by the Council and the Developer on valuation matters, have also corresponded with individual landowners and where appropriate provided desk top valuations on outstanding interests to be acquired. All landowners have been offered a site visit by GL Hearn. To date, of the remaining interests to be acquired, Unit 2 Enterprise Industrial Estate, Units 28 and 35 Bolina Industrial Estate, Unit 11 Orion Industrial Estate and Units 10 & 11 Excelsior Works Industrial Estate have allowed GL Hearn access for an internal inspection and subsequent valuation reports have been issued to the landowners as a basis for negotiation.

8.7 The Developer has also prepared a relocation strategy which has been submitted to the Council and approved under the Section 106 Requirements. A copy of the approved strategy
is appended to this Statement of reasons at Appendix H. The Section 106 Agreement requires the Developer to implement the approved strategy.

8.8 [One residential building is included within the Order. This is the property known as Bridge House which is a house in multiple occupation owned by an investor/landlord.]

8.9 The Council will provide support to residential occupiers where required through their Housing Options Centre. Contact information for the services available will be provided to all resident occupiers.⁶

8.10 The two largest remaining land interests by area comprise the leasehold interests vested in the MCS and MFC. The Council and the Developer have been in regular communication with the MCS over several years regarding the development of the Scheme and the acquisition of MCS’s leasehold interest in the Lion’s Centre, the facility that MCS currently occupy. The Council has attended the MCS trustees meeting a number of times to provide updates on the Scheme.

8.11 In recent months the Council and the Developer have engaged in detailed negotiations with MCS regarding heads of terms for the surrender of their leasehold interest in the Lion’s Centre and subsequent relocation to the SCSF building within Phase 2 of the Scheme. This engagement has taken the form of a series of meetings between the Council, the Developer and a representative from the MCS board of trustees. MCS has appointed solicitors and negotiations regarding the surrender of the MCS lease and MCS’s relocation to the new sports facilities (Energize) in Phase 2 continue.

8.12 Attempts by the Developer over a number of years to acquire MFC’s leasehold interest in the land around the Stadium and the rights to carry out the upgrade works to the Stadium façade (including against the background of the land sale agreement between the Council and the Developer relating to the Council’s freehold interest) have so far failed. The developer has submitted a formal offer to MFC for that interest, but MFC remain unwilling to negotiate any agreement for the surrender of their leasehold interest. MFC maintain that they wish to redevelop the land around the Stadium themselves in a manner consistent with the Developer’s proposals. Despite being given ample opportunity to do so, however, MFC have not submitted any planning application, nor otherwise produced any detailed proposals. Nor (despite being advised to do so) have they provided a business case and funding strategy which demonstrates how any such proposals can be carried out in a manner which fits in with and does not prejudice the wider Scheme, including from a viability perspective.

8.13 There have been more recent discussions between the Developer, MFC and the Council regarding the rights required by MFC in order to continue operating the Stadium in the event the Order in respect of the land around the Stadium is confirmed.

8.14 Negotiations with MFC will continue in parallel with the Order process and efforts will be made to reach agreement for disposal of their interest to the Developer or the Council and the grant of appropriate rights being reserved to MFC in respect of the land around, and required for continued operation of, the Stadium.

8.15 Updated details as to the position regarding acquisition will be provided in due course.

⁶ Note: heads of terms have been agreed between the Developer and owner of Bridge House for the sale of the Property to the Developer. The owner is to relocate existing tenants to another property he owns. The text in paras. 8.8 and 8.9 will be deleted if the sale completes prior to the CPO being made.
9. **THE CASE FOR COMPULSORY PURCHASE**

9.1 The Order Land forms part of the Site and is situated within New Cross ward in the north west corner of the Borough, adjacent to the London Borough of Southwark. The Order Land and the Site are within an area which presents as a degraded low quality environment which is overwhelmingly industrial in character with industrial estates established in the 1970’s and 1980’s as part of a previous package of funding for economic development, which are closed off and inward looking and within a wider area severed by wide viaducts with an environment which discourages pedestrian access and connectivity. Access into and out of the Site is limited by a number of constraints including railway lines, poor pedestrian crossing facilities and no direct access to South Bermondsey Station. The area is largely devoid of identifiable features such as local shops, community and leisure facilities.

9.2 The area within which the Order Land is situated suffers from serious physical, social and economic deprivation including a lack of accessibility in a poor physical environment, with high levels of unemployment, low skills and qualification attainment, health inequality, and issues of housing affordability and overcrowding. Appendix I contains details of the New Cross Ward profile (2014), compared with the Borough as a whole.

9.3 The Index of Multiple Deprivation which looks at a range of indicators covering income, employment, health, education, training, skills, living conditions and access to services saw Lewisham ranked as the 39th most deprived local authority area in England with a number of areas ranked in the 20% most deprived areas in England. New Cross is one of the most deprived wards in the Borough with particular health inequalities when compared with other parts of the Borough. In response, the Core Strategy seeks to promote social inclusion and strengthen the quality of life and well-being for new and existing residents of the Borough by addressing deprivation and health inequalities in New Cross and other more deprived parts of the Borough, creating safer and stronger communities by reducing crime and fear of crime through innovative design and land use policies, as well as providing physical, social and green infrastructure including high quality health and education facilities that are accessible and suitable to all of the Borough’s residents to foster independent community living.

9.4 The applicable policy framework for the Order Land includes, inter alia, the London Plan, Core Strategy and the NPPF.

9.5 The NPPF provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development where, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF specifically states that ‘housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Good design is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

9.6 The Site falls within the South East London Sub-Region, where policy seeks to encourage new development that underpins the sub-region’s dynamism and potential, and delivers the priority for delivering regeneration and transport improvements and links from the capital and the Thames Gateway. The London Plan encourages the Council to accommodate substantial growth for London’s economy and population, whilst optimising the development of Opportunity Areas and ensuring that housing provision is supported by social and community infrastructure.

9.7 The Spatial Strategy within the Core Strategy identifies four Regeneration and Growth Areas where the majority of the Borough’s new housing, retail and employment uses will be focused. The Regeneration and Growth Areas will provide key regeneration and development opportunities and provide a clear basis and focus for new homes and jobs which contribute to local regeneration, thus addressing deprivation and improving social inclusion. Deptford, Deptford Creekside and New Cross/New Cross Gate is one of the four Regeneration and Growth Areas where the scale of change will be most pronounced in this part of the Borough and has the potential for long term physical and socio-economic benefits. It is considered to be a prime location for delivering a substantial portion of the identified
housing need and required employment floorspace within the Borough and is proposed to accommodate 2,300 new homes by 2016 and a further 8,325 new homes by 2026.

9.8 Spatial Policy 2 within the Core Strategy identifies five strategic sites which are to act as a catalyst for regeneration of the area. The Site is one of such strategic sites. Strategic Site Allocation 3 (SSA3) within the Core Strategy identifies the Site for comprehensive mixed use development and sets out specific requirements for a comprehensive phased approach to re-development. Within the priorities in SSA3, the Site is identified as representing an opportunity to transform the environment and infrastructure and create a new destination around Millwall Football Stadium, which currently is not enhanced or improved by the surrounding industrial estates. It is considered that the re-development of the Site, with the retention or replacement of employment uses on site would contribute to the economy of the Borough, increase its diversity and offer new types of jobs and training opportunities that are currently limited locally.

9.9 The purpose for which the Order Land is required is considered to meet the objectives of the London Plan, Core Strategy and the NPPF and fits within the adopted/applicable planning framework for the area within which the Order Land and the Site are situated. Against this background, the Outline Planning Permission and the S73 Permission have been granted.

9.10 The Order Land is required to facilitate the comprehensive delivery of the Scheme which in turn is considered to deliver a number of key social, economic and environmental benefits. These are addressed more fully in Section 3 of this Statement of Reasons. Key outputs include:

- The regeneration of a deprived area;
- Approximately 2,400 new homes of a variety of types and tenure including affordable housing;
- Approximately 2,000 new jobs;
- A new Overground station on the East London Line, enhanced public transport and accessibility and new new pedestrian and cycle routes;
- Other infrastructure, including highway/junction improvements;
- New and enhanced public realm;
- A significant new sports facility;
- New and enhanced security and safety measures;
- Hotel and conferencing facilities;
- New social infrastructure including health, faith, community space, library and health facilities;
- Roof planting to assist habitat creation;
- A new creative quarter and space for business start-ups.

9.11 It is considered that the Scheme will deliver significant social, environmental and economic benefits and fully realise the planning and regeneration policy objectives set at National, Regional and Local level as well as delivering against other relevant policy including the Council's Regeneration and Sustainable Community Strategies.

9.12 The Order Land comprises a number of discrete ownerships which are required in order to ensure comprehensive delivery of the Scheme and achieve the planning and other policy
objectives for the area within a reasonable timescale. Although reasonable efforts have been made, and will continue to be made, to acquire the necessary land and rights by agreement, to-date it has not been possible to achieve acquisition by negotiation. The Council considers that the Order is necessary to acquire all the land and rights needed for the Scheme to give certainty that the Scheme can come forward within a reasonable timescale and so that the wider public benefits that the Scheme and realisation of the policy objectives can be achieved.

9.13 Notwithstanding that the Order has been made, the Developer and the Council will continue to seek to acquire the necessary land and rights by agreement.

9.14 Section 6 of this Statement of Reasons addresses the question of delivery of the Scheme and the likelihood of it coming forward within a reasonable timescale. For the reasons given in Section 6, the Council has concluded that the development would be viable, has a clear and achievable delivery strategy and that the necessary resources, including funding, will be available to achieve the purpose of the Order within a reasonable timescale.

9.15 The Council has also considered whether the purpose for which land and rights are proposed to be acquired could reasonably be achieved by any other means, including by other existing landowners, within a reasonable timescale. For the reasons given in paragraphs 6.31 to 6.33 of this Statement of Reasons, the Council does not consider the purposes for which the Order Land is required could reasonably be achieved by other means or that the objectives might be realised elsewhere.

9.16 As set out in Section 11 of this Statement of Reasons, the Council has had full regard to the Human Rights implications of pursuing the Order and taken into account the economic well-being of the locality in terms of regeneration, housing need, sustainable communities and environmental improvements and has carefully considered the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest. In this instance, the Council considers that the Order is required in the public interest and is consistent with the ECHR and 1998 Act in that the public purpose of securing the Order Land for the Scheme and concomitant economic, social and environmental benefits are of sufficient weight to override the interference with human rights that the Order necessarily involves, and that compulsory acquisition is necessary to achieve that purpose. It is also considered that the Order is proportionate having regard to the alternative means of securing the redevelopment of the Order Land and the associated regeneration of the area.

9.17 In all the circumstances, the Council considers there is a compelling need in the public interest for compulsory acquisition.

Special considerations

9.18 None of the existing buildings within the Order Land or on the Site are listed or locally listed and none of the Order Land/Site is in a conservation area. The Order Land is, however, within an Archaeological Priority Zone.

9.19 In addition there are 119 designated ‘heritage assets within 1km of the boundary of the Site, including listed buildings, non-listed buildings of local interest, conservation areas and Southwark Pier (a Registered Grade II Park and Garden) and Greenwich Maritime World Heritage Site, which is to the south east of the Site. These heritage assets are listed in Appendix J

Government Departments

9.20 No correspondence has been received from Government Department regarding the Scheme.
10. **HUMAN RIGHTS**


10.2 Of particular relevance to the compulsory purchase process are Articles 6 and 8 of the Convention regarding entitlement to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal and respect for privacy and family life respectively and Article 1 of the First Protocol which concerns the protection of property.

10.3 The CPO Guidance advises that “a compulsory purchase order should only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest. An acquiring authority should be sure that the purposes for which the compulsory purchase order is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. Particular consideration should be given to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, and in the case of a dwelling, Article 8 of the Convention”.

10.4 As regards Article 6 rights the Scheme has been publicised and consultation has taken place with parties potentially affected by the Order. All those parties whose interests are identified and included in the Order will be notified and have the right to make objections or other representations to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and to be heard at a public inquiry or by means of written representations. The statutory process and right for affected parties to pursue remedies in the High Court where appropriate, are compliant with Article 6.

10.5 Both Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol rights are qualified rights and may therefore be overridden where it is considered that the interference with these rights are proportionate and that the interference is necessary in the interests of, amongst other things, national economic well-being.

10.6 The European Court of Human Rights has recognised in the context of Article 1 of the First Protocol that “regard must be had to the fair balance that has to be struck between the competing interests of the individual and of the community as a whole”, and both public and private interests have been taken into account in the exercise of the authority’s powers and duties as a local authority. The Council considers that the Order constitutes a fair balance between the public benefits accruing from the acquisition and implementation of the Scheme and the private rights affected by the Order.

10.7 It is acknowledged that the Order if confirmed will result in the taking of property. However, this will be in accordance with a statutory process which was held to be compliant with Article 6 of the Convention which provides that “everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law”.

10.8 The CPO process undertaken by the Council has taken into account the economic well-being of the locality in terms of regeneration, housing need, sustainable communities and environmental improvements. The process already allows for the payment of compensation to those where properties and other private rights are affected by the acquisition of land under the CPO process. Compensation will be payable in accordance with the Compulsory Purchase Code (comprised in statute and case law) and including the market value of the property interest compulsorily acquired, together with (where appropriate) disturbance, statutory loss payment and home loss payments.
10.9 Moreover, in pursuing this Order, the Council has carefully considered the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest. In this instance it is considered that the Order is required in the public interest and is consistent with the ECHR and 1998 Act in that the public purpose of securing the Site for the redevelopment described herein and concomitant economic, social and environmental benefits are of sufficient weight to override the interference with human rights that the Order necessarily involves and that compulsory acquisition is necessary to achieve that purpose.

10.10 It is also considered that the Order is proportionate having regard to the alternative means of securing the redevelopment of the Order Land and the associated regeneration of the area.
11. **REGNERATION AND EQUALITIES STATEMENT**

11.1 A Regeneration and Equalities Statement has been undertaken. This sets out the regeneration effects of the Scheme and further identifies how the Scheme and Order has taken account of the potential impact of the Scheme on equalities groups as stipulated under the Equalities Act 2010. A summary of the key findings are detailed below and the full copy of the document can be found at Appendix K.

11.2 The Scheme represents a significant investment in a deprived area in need of comprehensive regeneration. The provision of new jobs, homes, community facilities, and the opportunities they bring to local communities, can help to drive the wider regeneration of the area going forward.

**Problems of deprivation**

11.3 North Lewisham, and New Cross in particular, currently face a number of serious socio-economic challenges that need co-ordinated intervention.

11.4 Deprivation is widespread in the area and challenges include high levels of unemployment, low skills and qualification attainment, health inequality, and issues of housing affordability and overcrowding.

11.5 In physical terms, the Site itself suffers from poor accessibility and permeability in a run-down physical environment.

**How the Scheme will address deprivation**

11.6 Overall, the Scheme represents an opportunity to address the socio-economic challenges outlined above by delivering a comprehensive mixed use regeneration project that can provide a step-change in both the perception of the area and the realities faced by local residents. The increased accessibility, jobs and business space, and new homes can provide major public benefits to existing residents as well as occupiers of new space in the future. This is set in the context of a regionally-significant range and quantum of sports facilities, and other beneficial and inclusive community facilities and a newly-accessible urban environment.

11.7 The overwhelming public benefits of the Scheme will help to transform the area and improve the quality of life of existing and future residents, kick-starting a process of regeneration in the local area, by:

- Bringing an uplift of around 2,400 homes in a range of sizes, types and tenures with sensitive design and accessibility standards, to help alleviate pressure on housing need;
- Facilitating a new Overground station on the East London Line in the south-east corner of the site, linked by a Stadium Boulevard to the existing South Bermondsey station at the north west;
- Creating around 2,000 new jobs and business space through securing private sector investment in growing sectors that provide local residents with entrepreneurial opportunities, and contributing to a new growth hub for North Lewisham;
- Connecting with the wider economy in central London through attracting new visitors and residents to the area and retaining their spending in local businesses and services;
- Supporting local residents with employment and training packages tailored to address their specific needs, so that residents can take advantage of additional jobs locally and compete for higher skilled jobs in the wider London labour market;
- Delivering physical improvements, including good quality street scene, public open spaces and new buildings to establish this as a new neighbourhood - an area people
want to live or work in or visit. The design and accessibility improvements will provide a new setting for residents, businesses and Community uses and events, minimising perception and fear of crime and opening up a previously inaccessible area to all current and future residents;

- Providing the scale and critical mass of development to change perceptions of the area; and

- Providing opportunities to lead healthy lifestyles and giving access to community facilities in an active environment.

Equality and protected characteristics

11.8 In undertaking a major development, including CPO, it is critical to assess the impacts on residents, visitors and employees – and particularly any disproportionate effects of the proposals on vulnerable people, protected groups or protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, and identify associated mitigation.

11.9 Each element of the Scheme has been assessed with the effects on these groups in mind, with mitigation and monitoring identified where appropriate, and set in the context of the overwhelming public benefit gained from the development. By providing the regeneration benefits outlined above, the Scheme will help to redress a number of aspects of social inequality and deprivation that exist here for groups that are particularly vulnerable, promote social inclusion, and help to foster good relationships between different people.

Stakeholder engagement

11.10 Throughout the process, the Developer has undertaken frequent community engagement and consultation, with a particular focus on hard-to-reach groups, in order to inform the design and operation of the scheme and relate it back to the needs of local people. Consultation has been inclusive of all stakeholders and community groups, and recognises the importance of key demographic groups prevalent in the area, including young people and BME groups. The Outline Planning Application, 3.01 Supporting Reports, 3 Statement of Community Engagement, February 2011, includes the full list of all meetings and events held as part of the pre-application process.

11.11 The operation of facilities and selection of occupiers has been (and will continue to be) managed to be inclusive and in line with the aspirations of the local community, making particular efforts to eliminate discrimination and foster good relations between people.

Conclusion

11.12 Currently, the area within which the Order Land and the Site are situated faces high levels of deprivation and inequality when compared to standards in the Borough and London as a whole. The Scheme will provide overwhelming public benefit in this area, thereby benefitting the local communities and the wider South East London area. The Scheme represents a significant investment of an under-utilised site in a severely deprived area in North Lewisham, bringing forward jobs and business space, homes, and community facilities including regionally significant sports facilities, within a well-designed publicly accessible environment. The Developer has acquired a significant proportion of the Site, and requires the assistance of compulsory purchase powers on remaining elements to ensure that a comprehensive, site-wide regeneration programme can be delivered.

11.13 North Lewisham currently suffers from serious physical, social and economic deprivation including a lack of accessibility in a poor physical environment, with high levels of unemployment, low skills and qualification attainment, health inequality, and issues of housing affordability and overcrowding. Several elements of the Scheme could lead to an overwhelming public benefit and help to transform the area and improve the quality of life of existing and future residents. The Scheme could kick-start a process of regeneration in the local area, by:
• Creating new jobs and business through securing private sector investment in growing sectors that provide local residents with entrepreneurial opportunities, and contributing to a new growth hub for North Lewisham;

• Connecting with the wider economy in central London through attracting new visitors and residents to the area and retaining their spending in local businesses and services;

• Supporting local residents with employment and training packages tailored to address their specific needs, so that residents can take advantage of additional jobs locally and compete for higher skilled jobs in the wider London labour market;

• Delivering major physical improvements, including good quality street scene and new buildings to establish this as a new neighbourhood - an area people want to live or work in or visit;

• Providing the scale and critical mass of development to change perceptions of the area; and

• Providing opportunities to lead healthy lifestyles and giving access to community facilities in an active environment.

11.14 By providing the regeneration benefits outlined above, the Scheme could help to redress a number of aspects of social inequality and deprivation that exist here for groups that are particularly vulnerable. In undertaking a major development, including CPO, it is critical to assess the impacts on residents, visitors and employees. In doing so, it is vital to assess any disproportionate effects of the proposals on vulnerable people, protected groups or protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, and identify associated mitigation.

11.15 [The Scheme will necessitate the removal of one residential property (Bridge House). It is recognised that residents will therefore be affected by the proposals and there is the potential for negative impact where residents include people with protected characteristics and/or dependencies on their residential location. Given that the Scheme will deliver a significant number of new, accessible homes (many likely to be in the private rented sector) and rates of background turnover in the private sector, the likely impact is considered minimal.] 7

11.16 In addition, the Scheme will create up to 2,400 new homes that are designed to be accessible, meeting Lifetime Homes standards as a minimum and 10% of which will be wheelchair accessible. The design standards will anticipate the needs of current and future residents and visitors with disabilities, older people with limited mobility, and other groups such as parents with children. The significant uplift in accommodation on-site will help to alleviate problems faced by residents in terms of accessing homes given the range of tenures and sizes, including affordable homes that respond to housing need which disproportionately affects some groups with protected characteristics.

11.17 A number of business units will need to be removed from the site through CPO. This process will have a long lead-in time given the phasing of the development, and all affected businesses will be given help in finding new premises via a Relocation Strategy. The uplift of 2,000 construction and operational jobs created in the development represent a potentially significant benefit to local residents. They will be in a range of sectors and skill levels, with a mix of flexible employment and entry-level jobs that can be particularly accessible to hard-to-reach groups including some of those with protected equalities characteristics. Additionally,

7 Note: heads of terms have been agreed between the Developer and owner of Bridge House for the sale of the Property to the Developer. The owner is to relocate existing tenants to another property he owns. The text in para.11.5 will be deleted if the sale completes prior to the CPO being made,
the Developer and the Council have committed to local employment and brokerage schemes to maximise the employment benefits for local people.

11.18 The Scheme will also bring forward a significant offer in terms of community facilities – including regionally significant sporting facilities, a faith centre, health centre, and improved public realm and open space. The operation of these facilities and selection of occupiers has been (and will continue to be) managed to be fully inclusive and to engage with the local community, making particular efforts to eliminate discrimination and foster good relations between people.

11.19 The design and accessibility improvements will provide a new setting for residents, businesses and community uses and events, minimising perception and fear of crime and opening up a previously inaccessible area to all current and future residents, including those with limited mobility, children and older people.

11.20 The comprehensive re-development of the Site needs to take due regard of the impacts on current users and occupiers of the Site. The area already has a strong sporting heritage through Millwall FC and the Lions Community Scheme – which will be able to continue its good work in engaging with hard-to-reach groups in the community in new high-quality floorspace within the new sports facility on-site (Energize).

11.21 Throughout the process, the Developer has engaged in detailed and frequent community engagement and consultation, with a particular focus on hard-to-reach groups. Consultation has been inclusive of all stakeholders and community groups, and recognises the importance of key demographic groups prevalent in the area, including young people and BME groups.

11.22 Overall, the Scheme represents an opportunity for the comprehensive delivery of a mixed use regeneration project in an area of socio-economic deprivation and need. The offer of increased accessibility, jobs and business space accessible to local people and fostering entrepreneurship and skills development, and new homes in a range of tenures can provide major public benefits to existing residents as well as occupiers of new space in the future. This is set in the context of a regionally-significant range and quantum of sports facilities, and other beneficial and inclusive community facilities that will help to redress current social inequalities in the area.
12. **ENQUIRIES**

**Website**

12.1 Information about the Scheme and the Order as it progresses is available on the Council’s website at:

HTTP://WWW.LEWISHAM.GOV.UK/INMYAREA/REGENERATION/DEPTFORD/NORTH-DEPTFORD/PAGES/SURREY-CANAL.ASPX

12.2 Additional information is available at:

www.newbermondsey.com

12.3 The Order documents and other documents listed below can be inspected during normal office hours at [TBC] and may also be viewed at:

12.4 Every effort will be made to assist parties affected by the Order to relocate where required. Any such party should in the first instance contact SCT@lewisham.gov.uk.

12.5 Further contact details are as follows:

12.5.1 **General Enquiries**

Council Officers – Tim Chaudhry or Kpolm Lotsu

SCT@lewisham.gov.uk

020 8314 3530

Regeneration & Asset Management

4th Floor Laurence House

Catford

SE6 4RU

12.5.2 **Land/Compensation Enquiries.**

David Conboy

CPO and Regeneration Associate Director

GL Hearn Limited

280 High Holborn

London

WC1V 7EE

Tel: 020 7851 4811

Email: david.conboy@glhearn.com
12.5.3 Planning Enquiries

020 8314 7400
planning@lewisham.gov.uk

12.5.4 Legal Enquiries

Jocelyn Denton
Bond Dickinson LLP – Legal Director
0345 415 0000

12.6 Should the reader wish to contact the Developer, the relevant contact details are:

Renewal, Roof Top, Guild House, Rollins Street, London SE15 1EP.
T: +44(0) 20 7358 1933
E: info@renewalgroup.co.uk
www.newbermondsey.com

Public inquiry rules and documents

12.7 This is a Statement of Reasons which is not intended to discharge the Council’s statutory obligations under the Compulsory Purchase (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2007.

12.8 A list of documents to be referred to is attached at Appendix M. The Council reserves the right to amend the list of documents or any other part of its Statement of Case in due course.
APPENDIX B - ORDER MAP

Note: Map to be as per Order Map when CPO made.
APPENDIX E - LAND OWNERSHIP PLANS

Note: plans to be included within Statement of Reasons to reflect Ownership when CPO made.
APPENDIX F - PLANNING POLICIES

1. To include:

1.1 Lewisham Core Strategy (June 2011)
1.2 Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (November 2014)
1.3 London Plan (March 2015)
1.4 National Planning Policy Framework
1.5 National Planning Policy Guidance
1.6 Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy (2010)
1.7 Mayor of London’s Housing Strategy (2014)
1.8 Mayor of London’s Air Quality Strategy (2010)
1.9 Mayor of London’s Biodiversity Strategy (2002)
1.13 Mayor of London’s Securing London’s Water Future (2011)
1.14 Mayor of London’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014)
1.15 Mayor of London’s London View Management Framework SPG (2012)
1.16 Mayor of London’s Accessible London – Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (2014)
1.17 Mayor of London’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012)
1.18 Mayor of London’s Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG (2007)
1.19 Mayor of London’s Land for Industry and Transport SPG (2012)
1.21 Mayor of London’s The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition SPG (2014)
1.22 Mayor of London’s Social Infrastructure (2015)
1.23 Mayor of London’s Housing Strategy (2015) and Draft Interim Housing SPG (2015)
1.25 Lewisham Planning Obligations SPD (2015)
1.26 Lewisham Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014
1.27 Lewisham Open Space Strategy (2012-2017)
1.28 Lewisham Tall Buildings Study (2012)
1.29 Millwall Building Heights Assessment (2010)
1.30 Hatcham Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)
1.31 Tall buildings, Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)
APPENDIX G - LAND INTERESTS TO BE ACQUIRED

10 Note: table to be included will reflect position regarding interests remaining to be acquired when CPO made.
Relocation Strategy for owners and tenants of Commercial and Residential property required for the New Bermondsey Regeneration, November 2015

1. Background

1.1 The s106 development agreement (30/03/12) sets out the requirements for Renewal to produce and make available on their website a relocation strategy that seeks to assist current occupiers of the New Bermondsey development site (formerly Surrey Canal) with advice and help on all matters pertaining to their relocation:

_The Developer shall:_

3.1 within three months of the date of the Planning Permission submit to the Council for approval a strategy document (the "Relocation Strategy") in connection with the relocation of occupiers at the Site, with such strategy to set out what support is to be provided by whom over what period and include as a minimum:

3.1.1 a relocation website connecting to active commercial agents;

3.1.2 advice on negotiating terms;

3.1.3 flexible tenancies to facilitate easy relocation as opportunities arise;

3.1.4 identification of opportunities to relocate tenants from early Phases of the Development into vacant units in later Phases;

3.1.5 liaison with owners of local industrial estates to identify opportunities for businesses to relocate in the area;

3.1.6 masterplan progress newsletter to occupiers of all existing non-residential properties within the Site;

1.2 This relocation strategy sets out how Renewal (the Developer) is meeting the above obligations and to illustrate work and support it is providing to tenants, residents and commercial investors within the New Bermondsey development area, with identifying appropriate alternative accommodation and advising on the process of relocation.

2. The Site

2.1 The site comprises 10.7 hectares and is situated in the northern most part of the London Borough of Lewisham. It is bordered by Rollins Street to the south and South Bermondsey Station to the north. It is largely occupied by small industrial businesses.
In 2010 the London Borough of Lewisham (the Council) changed the land designation from strategic industrial to land suitable for mixed use, which was then enshrined in their Core Strategy (June 2011).

2.2 Outline Planning Consent for New Bermondsey was granted by the Council in March 2012 and the scheme was designated a Housing Zone by the Greater London Authority in February 2015 with the objective of accelerating delivery. The development will deliver 2,400 new homes, 2000 new jobs and a new station on the London Overground (New Bermondsey). The build out period is projected to be eight years. The Developer has been assembling land for the regeneration since 2004 and is committed to ensuring its delivery.

Current occupiers

2.3 Presently there are 78 businesses within the re-development site. All buildings within the New Bermondsey development area are used for light industrial use, save for three units, which are occupied on a live/work basis, and one building that is classified as a house of multiple occupancy (HMO). All businesses within the redevelopment site will be offered the support detailed in this document as and when relocation is required.

2.4 The Developer has been providing assistance to tenants since it started purchasing units on the site in 2004. For every unit it has purchased the Developer has, where possible, kept existing tenants in the unit and amended all tenancy agreements to include break clauses of three to six months in order to allow the site to become vacant without delay ahead of any development.

Phasing plan
2.5 The Developer has agreed with the Council to carry out the development in accordance with the phasing plan (see above) unless a revision is otherwise agreed by the Council. The Developer's current intention is to begin with phases 1A and 2 simultaneously and thereafter develop in order, phases 1B, 3, 4, 5 and 5A.

2.6 The anticipated starting date onsite for Phases 1A and 2 is the first quarter of 2017 and each phase will take two years to complete. It is anticipated that the starting date for Phase 1B will be the fourth quarter of 2018. Phases 3, 4, 5 and 5A will continue at regular intervals following the completion of these first three phases and each will take approximately two years to complete.

3. **s106 requirements**

Set out below are explanations of how the Developer is fulfilling each of the six requirements from the s106 development agreement listed in section 1.1.

3.1 'a relocation website connecting to active commercial agents'

The Developer is in close contact with all tenants either in person or by telephone and provides regular updates on progress of the development. All tenants are aware of which phase of development affects their unit and the latest time frames for the development of each individual phase. In addition, all tenants are also sent by email the development's newsletter *New Bermondsey News* (appendix 2). The Developer has a comprehensive website [http://www.newbermondsey.com](http://www.newbermondsey.com) which contains the latest details of the scheme and a downloadable copy of this relocation strategy will be available to view online once approved.

In addition, this website has the contact details for both the Developer and agents KALMARs who have been appointed to act as the official relocation agent for any residents, tenants and landowners who require advice on relocating. Established in 1967, KALMARs have many years experience in sales and lettings of commercial and residential properties across the South London and are ideally placed to offer independent expert advice, free of charge, on suitable available properties, market prices and the practicalities of the relocation process, either in person, by telephone or by email.

KALMARs are entirely independent of the Developer and the advice they would be able to offer would be separate to and uncontrolled by the Developer. The Developer is also happy to refer businesses to the Council’s business advisory service for further information on available premises.
3.2 ‘advice on negotiating terms’

As stated above, the Developer has appointed agents KALMARs to provide free and impartial assistance on the relocation process to any residents, tenants and landowners who require it. Based in Bermondsey, KALMARs work across the whole of south London and are ideally placed to offer advice on the latest commercial and residential properties available. Tenants have been provided in writing with contact details for the most appropriate people to speak with at KALMARs. These details can also be found in section 3.5 of this document. In addition, the Developer will provide any legal and practical advice they can on the relocation process such as negotiating tenancy agreements, break clauses, local values and alternative agents if required.

The Developer has committed to promoting the relocation of any businesses from within the redevelopment site within Lewisham in the first instance and will request that KALMARs begin by pursuing options within the Borough in their discussions with businesses seeking to relocate. KALMARs will maintain contact with the Council for information of available and suitable business premises within the Borough.

3.3 ‘flexible tenancies to facilitate easy relocation as opportunities arise’

As stated in section 2.4 of this document the Developer has, where possible, kept existing tenants in their units and has amended leases to ensure all tenancy agreements have short notice periods of three to six months to allow the maximum flexibility for the relocation process and ensure development is able to proceed. All tenants were made aware of the forthcoming development when they entered into the leases and have been regularly kept informed of when development work will require them to relocate.

3.4 ‘identification of opportunities to relocate tenants from early Phases of the Development into vacant units in later Phases’

The Developer will continue to ensure that each phase is fully occupied up until redevelopment commences. It will make every effort when managing occupancy in later phases to create space in appropriate units for existing tenants in earlier phases who need to relocate. The Developer maintains a comprehensive log of the specifications of all units on the site allowing it to effectively assess which units may be appropriate for an individual tenants' requirements.

In advance of the commencement on site, the Developer will offer to meet all tenants on that particular phase in order to discuss their relocation requirements. Where possible, tenants will be given the option to be relocated to units on later phases but where this is not possible KALMARs will use their expertise to find appropriate nearby premises.

3.5 ‘liaison with owners of local industrial estates to identify opportunities for businesses to relocate in the area’

As stated in section 3.1, the Developer has appointed agents KALMARs to act as official relocation agent for any residents, tenants and landowners who require advice on relocating. KALMARs will monitor the availability of suitable premises locally and
maintain an up to date database of properties which will be available on request. Tenants can contact KALMARs directly via the contact details below for free and impartial advice on their relocation. For advice on industrial units Tenants should speak to Luke Osborne and for advice on residential properties they should contact Anthony Tappy-Day.

KALMARs
Jamaica Wharf
Shad Thames
London
SE1 2YU

0207 403 0600
info@kalmars.com
http://www.kalmars.com

Tenants and residents will of course be free to use any other agents they wish and the Developer will provide any advice or recommendations they can offer on other appropriate agents, should it be required.

3.6 ‘masterplan progress newsletter to occupiers of all existing non-residential properties within the Site’

The Developer has sent by email the first issue of the development’s newsletter *New Bermondsey News* (appendix 2). The first issue was published in February 2015 and it is envisaged there will be 2-4 issues of this newsletter per year once the development is underway. This newsletter has also been sent to interested parties who have contacted the Developer about the development and is also available to all on www.newbermondsey.com.

4. Conclusion

4.1 This strategy has set out the work the Developer is undertaking in order to ensure that it is meeting the commitments made in the s106 development agreement that are detailed in section 1.1.

4.2 As set out in the rest of this document, the Developer is, and will continue to be, in regular contact with all residents, tenants and landowners on the New Bermondsey site in order to ensure as easy a relocation process for them as possible. The Developer will continue to keep them all fully and regularly informed on progress of the development and how it will impact on them through individual communications, a regular newsletter (appendix 2), and the development website www.newbermondsey.com. The Developer and agents KALMARs will be available throughout the process.
## APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Renewal         | T: +44 (0)20 7358 1933  
E: info@renewalgroup.co.uk |
| KALMARs         | KALMARs, Jamaica Wharf, Shad Thames, London, SE1 2YU  
T: 0207 403 0600  
E: info@kalmars.com  
http://www.kalmars.com |
|                 | Industrial units should contact Luke Osborne  
Residential properties should contact Anthony Tappy-Day |
| New Bermondsey  | Development website: www.newbermondsey.com  
Newsletter: New Bermondsey News |
Section 106 (S106)
Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Paula Carney
Stgnet Planning
9 Mansfield Street
London
WIG 9NY

Planning Service
Laurence House
Cafford
London
SE6 4RU

phone 020 8314 7400
fax 020 8314 3127
Cil@lewisham.gov.uk
date: 10 December 2015
our reference: DC/11/76357

PLANNING APPLICATION:
SITE ADDRESS: DC/11/76357
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:

Surrey Canal Triangle
Revisions to planning application for the comprehensive phased mixed-use development of the site for up to 240,000 m² of development. *Comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of the site, for up to 240,000sqm (GEA) of development, as set out in the revised Development Specification dated 1 July 2011, and as amended 2 September 2011. The development comprises: Class A1/A2 (Shops and Financial and Professional Services) up to 3,000 sq m; Class A3/A4 (Cafes/Restaurants and Drinking Establishments) up to 3,000 sq m; Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) up to 300 sq m; Class B1 (Business) between 10,000 sq m ? 15,000 sq m; Class C1 (Hotels) up to 10,000 sq m; Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) between 150,000 sq m ? 190,000 sq m (up to 2,400 homes of different sizes and types); Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) between 400 sq m ? 10,000 sq m; Class D2 (Leisure and Assembly) between 4,260 sq m ? 15,000 sq m (excluding the Stadium which remains but including a replacement ground person's store of 140 sq m). Involving the demolition of all existing buildings on the site with the exception of the Millwall FC Stadium (which is to be retained and its facade upgraded and / or re clad), Plot Excelsior 2 - Guild House (which is to be retained and extended), and Plot Excelsior 5 - Rollins House (which is to be retained, but not altered or extended as part of this planning application); the demolition and replacement of the existing Millwall FC ground person's store of approximately 140 sq m; redevelopment to provide a series of new buildings (including roof top and basement plant); re profiling of site levels; alterations to Surrey Canal Road and the re-alignment of Bollina Road; new streets and other means of access and circulation, including pedestrian/cycle paths carriageways and servicing areas; areas for parking for emergency services vehicles and outside broadcast units; external areas of hard and soft landscaping and publicly accessible open space; car and coach parking areas and
Dear Paula Carney,

I refer to your submission dated 9th December 2015 regarding the Relocation Strategy as required by Paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4 of Schedule 16 of the Section 106 Agreement dated 30th March 2012 associated with the redevelopment of the Surrey Canal Triangle site.

3 Relocation Strategy

The Developer shall:

3.1 within three months of the date of the Planning Permission submit to the Council for approval a strategy document (the 'Relocation Strategy') in connection with the relocation of occupiers at the Site, with such strategy to set out what support is to be provided by who over what period and include as a minimum:

3.1.1 a relocation website connecting to active commercial agents;

3.1.2 advice on negotiating terms;

3.1.3 flexible tenancies to facilitate easy relocation as opportunities arise;

3.1.4 identification of opportunities to relocate tenants from early phases of the Development into vacant units in later phases;

3.1.5 liaison with owners of local industrial estates to identify opportunities for businesses to relocate in the area;

3.1.6 masterplan progress newsletter to occupiers of all existing non-residential properties within the Site;

3.2 Not to commence any part of the Development unless and until the Relocation Strategy has been approved by the Council;

3.3 Implement the approved Relocation Strategy;

3.4 Not to Occupy the Development unless in accordance with the approved Relocation Strategy.

I can confirm that the Council is satisfied that the Relocation strategy submitted is acceptable to comply with the provisions of Schedule 16 of the s.106 Agreement.
Name and address of all recipient(s) of this notice
Paula Carney
9 Mansfield Street
London
WIG 9NY

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
John Miller
Head of Planning
London Borough of Lewisham
New Cross
Ward Profile
2014

Population (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>15,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>275,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Structure (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aged</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Group</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

Country of Birth (CACI,2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day-to-Day Activities are Limited a Lot</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-UK</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Household Income (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>28,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>29,538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Economic Activity** (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Self-Employed</th>
<th>F/T Student</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religion** (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

Percentage of people of each religion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Hindu</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Other Religion</th>
<th>No Religion</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing tenure** (Source: ONS Census, 2011)

Percentage of people in each tenure type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Owner occupier</th>
<th>Private rented</th>
<th>Social rented</th>
<th>Living Rent Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cross</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crime Rate per 1,000 population** (Source: Metropolitan Police 2013)

Period: 12 months to January 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs Offences</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud or Forgery</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft &amp; Handling Offences</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against the Person</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information on sources and data please refer to the Ward profile Glossary.

Produced by: Policy & Partnerships Unit, London Borough of Lewisham
PPU@Lewisham.gov.uk
APPENDIX J - HERITAGE ASSETS

(within 1km of the boundary of the Site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated archaeological deposit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of St Augustine, Lynton Road (Grade II*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Vicarage of above Church (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-41 New Cross Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Park School (Grade II) (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Clare College Mission Church (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Victuallers Benevolent Institute (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 1-100, 101-110 111-176 Asylum Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South Lodge, Railings and Gates 12 and 14 Asylum Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 to 332 and 302-304 Commercial Way (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 Old Kent Road (Grade II) (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kentish Drovers PH (Grade II) (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton Cottages, 6-8 and 10-12 New Cross Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880,882 and 884 Old Kent Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 and 34 New Cross Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-54 and 56 Kender Street (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 New Cross Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Five Bells PH, 115 New Cross Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 Telephone Kiosk, Monson Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9 (con) Canal Grove (Grade II) ??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas standard light (Grade II) (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue of George Livesey, Old Kent Road (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell Public Library/Livesey Museum (Grade II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Park and Garden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Park (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conservation Area

Hatcham Conservation Area

### Non Listed Buildings of Local Interest

- Victorian Chapel, Ilderton Road (east side) (Southwark)
- Victorian School buildings, Ilderton/Verney Road (Southwark)
- Slipper Baths, Ilderton/Stockholm Road (Southwark)

**Notes:**

The Environmental Statement (ES) submitted with the outline application [and updated for the Section 73 application] identifies the regeneration and community benefits that would come from the proposals as mitigation for the identified built heritage adverse effects. Taking account of these perceived benefits, the assessment identifies the following residual effects on built heritage assets during the construction and operation phases:

- Grade II* Listed Buildings – Minor adverse/Neutral;
- Grade II Listed Buildings – Minor adverse;
- Conservation Areas - Minor adverse;
- Registered Parks and Garden (Southwark Park) – Minor adverse; and
- Non listed buildings of local interest – Minor adverse.

No cumulative effects are identified during the construction phase. The proposed scale of the nearest major consented schemes (Silwood Estate, 763 Old Kent Road and Grinstead Road) are considered to limit any cumulative effect. The increase in construction traffic is identified, but it is not considered that this would have a significant effect on heritage assets because of its temporary nature. No significant cumulative adverse effects are therefore identified.
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INTRODUCTION

New Bermondsey

1.1 An outline planning application for the New Bermondsey regeneration was submitted by Renewal in February 2011, and granted consent in March 2012. New Bermondsey offers a significant opportunity to regenerate a run down and deprived area of North Lewisham, bringing forward jobs, homes, community facilities and new public spaces. The application included provision for:

1.2 The comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of the site for up to 240,000 square metres (GEA) of development comprising Class A1/A2 (Shops and Financial and Professional Services) up to 3,000 square metres, Class A3/A4 (Cafes/Restaurants and Drinking Establishments) up to 3,000 square metres, Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) up to 300 square metres, Class B1 (Business) between 10,000 -15,000 square metres, Class C1 (Hotels) up to 10,000 square metres, Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) between 150,000 - 190,000 square metres (up to 2,400 homes of different sizes and types), Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions) between 400 - 10,000 square metres, Class D2 (Leisure and Assembly) between 4,260 - 15,800 square metres, involving the demolition of all existing buildings on the site with the exception of the Millwall FC Stadium (which is to be retained and its façade upgraded and/or re-clad), Plot Excelsior 2 – Guild House (which is to be retained and extended), and Plot Excelsior 5 – Rollins House (which is to be retained, but not altered or extended as part of the planning application); the demolition and replacement of the existing Millwall FC grounds-person’s store of approximately 140 sqm; redevelopment to provide a series of new buildings (including roof top and basement plant); re-profiling of site levels; alterations to Surrey Canal Road and the re-alignment of the Bolina Road; new streets and other means of access and circulation, including pedestrian/cycle paths, carriageways and servicing areas; areas for parking for emergency services vehicles and outside broadcast units; external areas of land and soft landscaping and publicly accessible open space; car and coach parking areas and accesses to them; cycle storage; and, supporting infrastructure works and facilities including substations, energy centre(s), District Heating Network (DHN) connections to and between each plot, the proposed energy centre and the adjoining South East London Combined Heat and Power (SELCHP) plant (to the extent to which they lie within the Planning Application Boundary) and an Envac waste storage and handling system (including DNH and ENVAC connections to plots south of Surrey Canal Road under the carriageway of Surrey Canal Road, as altered).

1.3 In addition to securing the wider regeneration of a poor and deprived area of North Lewisham and contributing to the regeneration of the wider area, the scheme will deliver a number of key benefits including:

- 2,000 new jobs
- 2,400 new homes
- A new Overground station on the East London Line
- 2 new bus routes
- A £40m state-of-the-art regional sports complex
- New cycling and pedestrian routes
- A new faith and community centre
- A new home for the Council’s multi-faith and resources library
• A 150 bed hotel and conferencing centre
• GP facilities and a medical centre with specialism in sports injury
• A new park at Bridgehouse Meadows
• A creative/digital quarter
• A new and improved setting for The Den and Millwall Football Club
• A new home for the Millwall Community Scheme
• 5 new public squares and private gardens for residents

1.4 Following the application, a Section 73 application was made to slightly re-configure the site within agreed parameters - with the main material change being to incorporate all of the proposed sports facilities within a multi-purpose arena and indoor sports centre for basketball, badminton, boxing, cricket, climbing, football, hockey, gymnastics, netball, swimming and table tennis as well as a new home for the Millwall Community Scheme.

1.5 The Council’s Strategic Planning Committee resolved to grant consent for the Section 73 amendments in December 2013. Consent for the Section 106 for the Section 73 application was granted on the 18th December 2015.

1.6 A drop in application for a change of configuration to the area of Excelsior on which Rollins House was submitted to the Council in July 2014. A decision was deferred pending further information at a meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee on 13th November 2014 and again on 9th July 2015.

1.7 On 20th February 2015 the Mayor of London announced New Bermondsey as one of London’s Housing Zones which will accelerate the delivery of new homes and transport infrastructure including a new Overground station, two new bus routes and improved walking and cycling routes.
2 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

2.1 Renewal has acquired the overwhelming majority of the New Bermondsey site, not including Lewisham’s freehold interests which encompass the leasehold interests held by Millwall Football Club and the Millwall Community Scheme, and has a shared intention with the Council to ensure site-wide, comprehensive regeneration. The land subject to compulsory purchase is currently occupied by light industrial and warehouse units and one House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO). Renewal is in the process of acquiring the HMO (Bridge House). Once acquired, the owner will facilitate the relocation of current tenants to another property owned and maintained by the current owner. Heads of terms were agreed for the purchase of Bridge House with the vendor on the 29th October 2015. The legal process is underway and exchange and completion is due to happen imminently.

2.2 This report, commissioned by the Council, aims to:

- Set out the regeneration effects of the New Bermondsey development on the local area, particularly in terms of increasing housing provision as well as social, community and economic opportunities that will redress current inequalities faced by the area; and
- Identify how the development, which gained outline planning consent in 2012, and the proposed compulsory purchase of land, has taken due account of any potential impact on equalities groups as stipulated by the Equality Act 2010.

2.3 This report is presented in two parts:

PART 1

2.4 Part 1 highlights the regeneration effects of New Bermondsey and links them to prevailing socio-economic inequalities in the area.

2.5 This part of the report then appraises the elements of the development where Protected Groups or Protected Characteristics (as defined by the Equalities Act 2010) have the potential to be affected either negatively or positively, and details the mitigation and/or enhancement provided by the New Bermondsey development.

2.6 In addition to identified protected groups, this report takes account of a wider set of social inequality indicators including indicators of relative deprivation relating to employment, income, skills, and qualifications.

2.7 Part 1 then identifies the level of community engagement and stakeholder consultation undertaken throughout the planning application process and beyond submission.

PART 2

2.8 Part 2 forms a ‘Technical Annex’, outlining the legislative and policy requirements of an Equalities Impact Assessment, and provides a detailed assessment of the socio-economic context in the local area, to identify areas of prevailing inequality and deprivation / need. It also provides details of the level of community and stakeholder engagement undertaken throughout the planning application process.
PART 1

Regeneration Benefits of New Bermondsey
3 REGENERATION EFFECTS

3.1 New Bermondsey is an exceptional regeneration opportunity. North Lewisham suffers from multiple problems of deprivation and only a comprehensive, site-wide development of this scale and quality can create the critical mass needed to unlock the area’s potential and create a thriving community and a lively cultural quarter on the doorstep of central London.

Social Inequality in North Lewisham

3.2 A detailed socio-economic context for North Lewisham is included within Part 2 of this document, highlighting that the area has serious physical, social and economic deprivation, both in terms of identified ‘protected characteristics’¹ and wider determinants of social inequality. In summary:

- the local physical environment suffers from inaccessibility, a poor image and safety concerns, and is unattractive to pedestrians and cyclists;
- The local population has relatively high levels of deprivation, particularly acute here in terms of crime, employment, health, housing, income and living environment;
- There is a younger, more ethnically diverse population than average for London or Lewisham;
- Qualification attainment and occupational skill levels of residents are lower than average;
- Unemployment and worklessness are problems locally;
- Lewisham has a greater reliance on employment in the public sector, education and retail. New Cross is dominated by lower-skilled jobs in manufacturing, light industrial and logistics sectors;
- Health indicators are poor across a range of statistics including obesity, standardized mortality rates and hospital admissions compared to the Lewisham and London averages;
- There is a high proportion of private rented and social rented households, and a high degree of overcrowding; and
- Crime rates are higher than average in London.

New Bermondsey - Regeneration Summary

3.3 Located in an area suffering from severe multiple deprivation, the New Bermondsey regeneration has the potential to foster significant community, economic, physical and social benefits, and can aid in the regeneration of North Lewisham as a strategic part of a network of urban renewal in the wider south east area. New Bermondsey is a transformative project for the site and the wider area, putting the area on the map with a regionally significant sporting centre and bringing major benefits including new jobs, homes, public realm, health provision and crime reduction.

¹ As determined by the Equality Act (2010)
3.4 The surrounding area is in great need of investment in order to maximise the regeneration potential and build on an already strong sporting heritage to create a community with social inclusion as a central principle.

3.5 New Bermondsey can kick-start a process of regeneration at the north-west of the borough, with a number of key elements required to harness the potential of the area, including:

- The creation of **new jobs and business** by securing private sector investment in growing sectors that provide local residents with entrepreneurial opportunities, and contributing to a new growth hub for North Lewisham;

- Connecting with the wider economy in central London through **attracting new visitors** and residents to the area and retaining their spending in local businesses and services;

- Ensuring local residents have **employment and training** packages tailored to address their specific needs, and that educational results in the area continue to improve, so that residents can take advantage of additional jobs locally and compete for higher skilled jobs in the wider London labour market;

- Major **physical improvements**, including good quality street scene, new pedestrian and cycle paths and new buildings to establish this as a new neighbourhood - an area people want to live or work in or visit;

- Providing the scale and critical mass of development to **change perceptions** of the area; and

- Providing opportunities to lead **healthy lifestyles** and giving **access to community facilities** in an active environment.

3.6 The existing strengths of the area must be built upon and strengthened, including its multi-cultural community, its young population and creative enthusiasm, its location in relation to the Docklands and the City, and of particular uniqueness, is its sporting heritage established through football (Millwall Football Club) and the history of boxing on the Old Kent Road.

### Design Standards & Accessibility

**Design**

3.7 New Bermondsey will open up an area of land that is currently relatively inaccessible to the general public, given its use as predominantly industrial space. The mix of uses within New Bermondsey, including employment floorspace, high quality publicly accessible open space, community uses, and market and affordable housing will combine to bring a new mixed community to the New Cross ward and the new mixed community and facilities provides opportunities for social interaction between residents, workers and visitors.

3.8 There is a policy-driven\(^2\) target in North Lewisham to create a 'sense of place' through new buildings and contributions to an enhanced street environment which would raise the overall standard of design and

---

\(^2\) Lewisham Regeneration Strategy 2008-2020
environmental quality, improve permeability and accessibility, attract inward investment and improve vitality and viability of the local economy through increased jobs and economic spend.

3.9 The homes, hotel, retail and community facilities at New Bermondsey will be provided to modern design and accessibility standards. It is considered an important element to the scheme that all spaces are interlinked and provide a variety of animated as well as tranquil environments, providing a sense of place and radical improvement to the physical quality of the urban environment.

3.10 Rates of recorded crime in New Cross are higher than the average for London and Lewisham. New Bermondsey will help to address this problem with inclusive, safe, active and well-lit street environments to increase the perception of safety and reduce crime for all new and existing residents and visitors. A safer and more secure environment achieved through increased permeability, footfall, lighting and CCTV can aid in the reduction of perception of crime for current residents in the surrounding area, residents of the development, and visitors. In the neighbouring Silwood estate, which has been regenerated, Police report that crime levels have fallen significantly and the perception of safety has increased.

Accessibility

3.11 There is currently no formal publicly accessible open space within the New Bermondsey site. There are five main access routes into the Site, providing vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access from Bolina Road, Surrey Canal Road, Zampa Road, Rollins Street and Stockholm Road. However, these access points suffer from a poor image and safety concerns, and are unattractive to pedestrians and cyclists.

3.12 New Bermondsey will transform the area - breaking down current community severance, reconnecting the area through new walking/cycling routes and high quality public realm, creating new places for local people and setting a new benchmark for quality publicly accessible open space in the area. There will also be 5 new public squares created and £1m spent on regenerating the adjacent Bridgehouse Meadows.

3.13 Through sensitive design and a range of facilities linked in the development, it is intended that the new community and existing residents will be encouraged to have an active lifestyle, complemented by new pedestrian dominated routes, as well as new cycle lanes. Walking distances into and around the Site will be reduced, including through improvements to 14 surrounding railway arches and underpasses creating links into the surrounding areas, addressing issues of permeability.

3.14 Additionally, low public transport accessibility (PTAL) ratings in the area will be redressed through the addition of two new bus routes through the site, investment in a new Overground station (New Bermondsey) on the East London Line in the south-east corner of the site and the creation of Stadium Avenue, linking the two stations and cutting pedestrian journey times to both stations. The area already has a quick link into central London via South Bermondsey station (4 mins) – but this can be enhanced by the creation of a new station in the south-east of the site, particularly when delivered in parallel with regionally significant employment space and sports facilities.

3.15 Altogether, the provision of the individual elements of the scheme will inter-link to create a new neighbourhood where people will want to live, work and visit. Successful regeneration of this currently under-utilised, low-grade Site will stem from the combination of these elements - new homes, jobs, community facilities and publicly accessible open space - responding to the needs of the local population by tackling physical deprivation, providing opportunities for employment and skills uplift, generating vitality and reducing social inequalities. By changing perceptions of New Bermondsey, the development can foster
pride in the area, which combined with the opportunities created for engagement and employment will also support efforts to tackle crime and anti-social behaviour.

Providing New Homes

3.16 There is an identified need for new housing in New Cross, Lewisham and London. In particular, the Mayor of London has identified specific Housing Zones – including New Bermondsey – as sites that will be accelerated to maximise development potential and provide the homes that are desperately needed as a result of projected population growth. Population growth has been significant in recent years in Lewisham and has contributed to an increase in household size, overcrowding and unaffordability. The problems are felt acutely in New Cross – with a greater demand for mixed tenures including a greater proportion of private rented and social rented households locally, high levels of over-crowding and an affordability gap, particularly at entry-level.

3.17 Access to a range of accessible, adaptable, well-designed and constructed housing is essential for building sustainable communities and reducing pressure on housing waiting lists, offering more opportunities for vulnerable groups (e.g. older people, young people, single parent and low-income households) to improve their standard of living. Making provision for accessible, adaptable, well-designed and constructed housing in a range of sizes and tenures therefore has the potential to help redress social inequalities, and can help to tackle levels of housing deprivation in this area.

3.18 New Bermondsey will provide 2,400 new homes in a range of types and tenures. Around 4,500 new residents will live in these homes, diversifying and strengthening the local community by increasing the proportion of working households with a stake in the future of the area locally, increasing spending and therefore creating additional jobs.

3.19 Access to affordable housing is an acute problem in Lewisham and London, with demand for social rented property outstripping supply, and existing households in social rented property experiencing overcrowding.

3.20 New Bermondsey will provide new social rented homes that help alleviate housing problems faced by equality groups, establishing a new attractive environment complete with amenity areas.

3.21 Research into lettings data collected as part of the Core Dataset by the National Housing Federation shows how new housing (including affordable housing), can increase economic activity rates in a deprived area. The data shows that the majority of social rented housing in Lewisham is let to existing residents of the borough, indicating that benefits of social rented and intermediate tenures will be felt locally.

3.22 Aside from the regeneration benefits of affordable housing, there are also related benefits by providing a new stock of homes in private tenures, by way of addressing problems of overcrowding and meeting the aspirations for accommodating growth and subsequent economic development, which will help to redress the current problems of affordability of housing as a whole in Lewisham and London.

3.23 The provision of homes at New Bermondsey for both ownership and rent both play key roles in meeting the needs of residents, in terms of security, flexibility and supporting the social rented sector. New Bermondsey will contribute to the rebalancing of North Lewisham, and the creation of a more sustainable community. Currently the area is dominated by a high proportion of social rented housing. New Bermondsey’s residential offer is more mixed and balanced, including all tenures and a range of sizes.
Public Open Space

New Cross currently has a lower than borough-wide average standard of parks and gardens per population as outlined in the Lewisham Leisure and Open Space Study (2010), and as such is considered an area of deficiency.

New Bermondsey offers a good level of provision of safe, well-designed and accessible open space (including 5,600-6,600 sqm of new accessible open space in five public squares, and more than 13,000 sqm of private communal open space for residents), which can respond to both the accessibility needs of the new development, but also the wider area – the greatly improved public realm can help to provide part of the wider urban fabric, linking the new homes, facilities and transport infrastructure.

The development of New Bermondsey will create vibrant new open spaces including a £1m contribution to the regeneration of the existing park at Bridgehouse Meadows, to the south-east of the development site. The redevelopment will be undertaken sensitively to high design standards and taking into account residents’ needs. A CABE ‘spaceshaper’ workshop was held with local residents and stakeholders in October 2010 to investigate the current use and potential of the space at Bridgehouse Meadows and further community and stakeholder consultation will be undertaken which will inform the design team’s approach to creating a revitalised community park based on community requirements.

The series of linked publicly accessible open spaces will greatly increase permeability and access for pedestrians and cyclists, providing new routes through the Site both North to South and east to West, opening up and joining the transport links at South Bermondsey and New Bermondsey rail stations creating a new transport interchange. The new development is built around a green armature that will run through the site. Starting at the north, there will be a public realm overhaul of the Bolina Road area to make it more attractive to residents and visitors, with a route running through Bolina Gardens, along Stadium Avenue, passing through stadium square, station square and on into Bridgehouse Meadows and beyond to link with New Cross. The Developer will also create a new public square on phase 1b, adjacent to the new station, Excelsior Square.

Employment

Local Need and Demand

At present, around half of the jobs in New Cross ward are in manufacturing, logistics and light industrial sectors, with also a significant representation of public sector employment. The site has a mix of low-density light industrial floorspace, mostly occupied by small, independent firms in construction, logistics and manufacturing.

As well as a high proportion of jobs in declining sectors, unemployment is also a problem locally. An analysis of 2011 Census data identifies that, in New Cross ward, unemployment is a significant problem with 9% of total working-age residents compared to 6% in London. Around 410 people are claiming Job Seekers Allowance or Universal Credit, and are out of work (known as the ‘claimant count’) (3.4%, compared to 1.9% in London).
3.30 Analysis of the sought occupation of these claimants locally reveals a demand for jobs across a range of skill levels, particularly mid-level roles including sales, service, skilled trades and administrative roles. A lower proportion than the London average are seeking lower skilled roles.

*Employment Generated at New Bermondsey*

3.31 The New Bermondsey regeneration programme is anticipated to create around 700 full-time equivalent construction jobs over the course of the 15 year construction period, as well as around 1,500 permanent new jobs in the leisure, business, retail and community sectors, compared to a current 366 (mainly light industrial and manufacturing) jobs on the site today, a number which is inclusive of the 137 jobs provided by Millwall FC and the Millwall Community Scheme which will remain. These new jobs will be created in the following sectors:

- B1/Business Incubation - **545** FTE jobs;
- Sports/Leisure - **215** FTE jobs;
- Medical/Creche - **81** FTE jobs;
- Retail A1/A2 - **163** FTE jobs;
- Retail A3/A4/AS - **156** FTE jobs;
- Hotel/Conference - **100** FTE jobs;
- Church/Auditorium - **100** FTE jobs;
- Site Management - **110** FTE jobs;
- Construction - **700** FTE jobs.

3.32 At present, the resident population of the area has a lower skills base and level of qualification attainment than average in London – by providing new introductions to work both in construction and operation, a development at New Bermondsey can help to give people new opportunities with entry-level and mid-level skilled positions (administration, service, sales and skilled trades) and help to redress long-term unemployment and economic inactivity.

3.33 The following chart identifies the sought occupation, by skill level of the current Job Seekers Allowance claimants in Lewisham, highlighting a significant level of need, spread across different sectors that match the kind of employment roles created both during construction and beyond as New Bermondsey becomes a new and thriving neighbourhood of London:
3.34 Mid-level roles including retail, administrative and service jobs are a key aspect for many of the employment-generating areas within the development, offering entry-level employment (and then clear routes to training and promotion) suitable for young unemployed people with low levels of educational attainment. Rates of offending can be particularly high amongst these groups and pathways into employment are vital in diverting people away from criminality towards more positive involvement in their local community and economy.

3.35 An analysis of 2011 Census data shows that in London, approximately 30% of all employees live within 5 km of their workplace, whereas in the wholesale, retail, hotel and restaurant sectors more than 36% of people live this close to their place of employment. As such, a significant number of jobs created are likely to benefit local residents, including those currently unemployed and seeking this kind of employment.

**Enhancing Employment Benefits**

3.36 The benefits of a large construction project such as this will be enhanced by tapping into jobs brokerage schemes for local unemployed people, and by fostering links with local education institutions to give people the opportunity to learn important skills while being offered the chance to earn money close to where they live.

3.37 Renewal have consulted with the Council’s Local Labour and Business Co-ordinator and prior to the Outline Planning Application met with the New Cross-based 170 Community Project who run training and access to employment courses for the local community, the New Cross Gate NDC and Action 4 Employment (A4e) about ways in which the scheme can enable local residents to access the job opportunities at New Bermondsey.
Additionally, the proposals for New Bermondsey include a commitment, via Section 106, to fully participate in the Local Labour and Business Scheme, and to achieve a target of at least 50% employment of local people and businesses through a Local Employment Strategy which sets out reasonable endeavours to promote and recruit employees, contractors and suppliers from Lewisham during the construction and operational phase of the development to ensure that benefits are felt locally.

Ensuring local residents have employment and training packages tailored to address their specific needs, and that educational results in the area continue to improve, so that residents can take advantage of additional jobs locally and compete for higher skilled jobs in the wider London labour market is a key aspiration for the development.

A Changing Economy

Employment projections (below) produced by the GLA (2013) show that it is likely that employment growth in London to 2036 will continue to be driven by service sector employment including professional and technical jobs, retail, hotels, health, education and business and other services (which includes sport and leisure). By contrast manufacturing, utilities and transport (the profile of jobs currently at New Bermondsey) will continue to decline significantly.

Figure B – Components of London’s Projected Employment Growth 2012-2036 (GLA, London Plan 2015)

Because of its current employment structure a trend based analysis would suggest that Lewisham is likely to capture little of this growth without a significant change in direction through the creation of new employment floorspace, improved access to markets in London and development to raise the profile of the borough as a working environment. The New Bermondsey regeneration will help to address this.

Growth sectors including culture, sports, arts and tourism are particularly beneficial to restructuring industrial areas that are seeking to diversify their economic bases. The wider environmental benefits (new
facilities, creative use of redundant space and buildings and improved infrastructure) and image change (lively, animated and cosmopolitan ambience) can positively alter outsiders negative mental maps of post-industrial areas and help re-position them as more attractive places for inward investment.

3.43 New Bermondsey has the opportunity to meet the needs of a young population with improving educational attainment, and a large labour force with a mix of skill levels, including highly qualified and skilled residents, meeting London’s aspirations for significant growth in knowledge industries.

**SMEs, Digital Media and Creative Industries**

3.44 While structural economic changes mean manufacturing is no longer a major contributor to job creation in the borough, other sectors have grown. There is now a strong recognition of the importance of creative industries to the Borough’s economy, which tend to be clustered in parts of Deptford, New Cross and Forest Hill due to business advantages of good public transport links and a good representation in a number of growing sectors.

3.45 Lewisham has existing strengths in small, start-up creative industries, and specifically digital media which is identified as the fastest growing area of the creative economy and accounts for two out of every three creative jobs in the UK. In 2011, Lewisham Council identified through a survey that there were over 600 digital creative businesses in the borough, many of which are small or micro-businesses. Phase 1B of the scheme includes a creative hi-tech digital hub, creating a focal point around which the many digital business in Lewisham can aggregate. Analysis of IDBR data highlights that the current figure is over 1,000 for micro-businesses in these sectors.

3.46 A greater proportion of residents in Lewisham have degree-level or higher qualifications compared to the London average, with 38% educated to degree level across the borough and a high proportion working in the knowledge industries. A large number of residents are self-employed or run micro-businesses that provide services to central London and benefit from access. The strength of the borough’s higher and further education offer, including Goldsmiths, University of London and Lewisham College and close proximity to Ravensbourne on the Greenwich Peninsula, translates into a number of new graduate start-ups each year.

3.47 Levels of entrepreneurship and small business start-up are high in Lewisham. With a rate of new business formation has been at or above the level for Inner London and London over the last 10 years, with 4,800 start-ups in Lewisham, which representing 34% of the total business stock and 12% of total employment, between 2008 and 2012. Rates of new VAT registrations give an indication to levels of entrepreneurship, and in Lewisham, there has been a steady year-on-year increase of new registrations since the mid-1990s, with a pre-recession high and a consistently higher-than London growth rate in registrations.

---

7 Ibid.
8 ONS (2013) VAT registrations/de-registrations by industry 1997-2007
3.48 Currently, there is a gap between the skill level of people who live in the borough and work there, and people who live there and commute out, with over 100,000 people leaving the borough to work (Annual Population Survey, 2014). Part of this is due to the draw of Central London, but this may also be a feature of a lack of business space locally suited to resident’s needs.

3.49 As previously mentioned, a key element of the New Bermondsey development is the Creative Industries Hub, which will be brought forward in phase 1b of the development adjoining the new station on the East London Line. This part of the development will include business start-up space, including affordable space, tailored towards small entrepreneurial business and the digital media sector.

3.50 The provision of flexible office and workshop space will help to foster entrepreneurial activity and the growth of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), giving the opportunity for local people to start-up businesses. This kind of space is often occupied by creative and cultural industries - sectors that are already strong locally partly due to the nearby Goldsmiths College. The provision of this kind of space responds to local needs, with a significant SME representation locally, a high concentration of firms and employees in this sector, and a high rate of start-ups in Lewisham.

3.51 New Bermondsey’s investment in well-located and accessible digital media business space meets aspirations of the Greater London Local Economic Partnership’s (LEP) Jobs and Growth Plan for London (GLA, April 2013) which sets out the approach to promoting growth and jobs. It outlines four priority areas including:

- Skills and employment – ensure Londoners have the skills to compete for and sustain London’s jobs;
- Micro, small and medium enterprises – support and grow London’s businesses;
- Science and technology – for the capital to be recognised globally as a world-leading hub; and
- Infrastructure – to keep London moving and functioning.

3.52 This provision also meets the LEP’s provisions for supporting SMEs to make the journey from start up to high growth, including:

- Exploring affordable workspace options; and
- Raising awareness of business support services and networks.

3.53 Located close to a new Overground station (New Bermondsey), the Creative Industries Hub will be highly accessible to a significant digital and creative market in Central London in 4 minutes and will have direct links to Silicon Roundabout (East London Tech City) on the London Overground network, promoting the area as a key satellite in inner London for high-end businesses, and raising the profile of North Lewisham as a creative employment location in-line with policy aspirations.

3.54 The following map identifies the concentration of digital media micro-businesses in the area, the proximity of central London via public transport, and the range of complementary education institutions nearby:
3.55 New Bermondsey has been identified as the favoured option for a ‘Film City’ in Lewisham\textsuperscript{10}, scoring excellently across most criteria in terms of location, accessibility, and critical mass to attract local businesses and those from outside the borough. As such, the proposed business incubation space will allow local residents the opportunity to set up businesses in affordable space, responding to the current local demand for space suitable for creative and digital industries and allowing local skilled graduates to stay in the area to work.

3.56 The creation of new jobs and business by securing private sector investment in growing sectors that provide local residents with entrepreneurial opportunities, and contributing to a new growth hub for North Lewisham.

3.57 At New Bermondsey, in a nationally-recognised area of acute employment and income deprivation and where the skills base is low and the unemployment rate is high, the transformation from low grade, low intensity uses to a more intensive, mixed-sector employment offer is a significant benefit. The intensified use of a currently under-used site can help to facilitate the borough’s diversification away from traditional


\textsuperscript{10}Lewisham Council commissioned a Feasibility Study in July 2012 for a ‘Film City’ – a centre for film and digital media in Lewisham that would mix studio and technical facilities, workspace and shared facilities in order to develop the emerging film and digital sector, link local partners and provide significant economic benefits for the Borough.
manufacturing and industrial sectors towards business services and other service industries and creative sectors that will help Lewisham’s economy to stabilise and grow.

**Wider Economic Effects**

3.58 As well as offering positive opportunities for local residents in terms of employment, a key factor in the success of New Bermondsey will be its ability to draw in visitors by providing high quality community facilities, sports and recreation, and hotel/conferencing facilities within a vibrant environment easily accessible from central London. At present, the Site is largely impermeable and has little to draw in visitors other than on match days. The transformation of the New Bermondsey Site will radically alter this and can help to promote North Lewisham as an attractive destination in London for business and leisure.

3.59 Increased visitor numbers contributes to regeneration of the wider area in many ways. Perhaps most importantly, the significant commercial offer, hotel, business incubation space, community facilities and regionally important sports facilities and event space being created as part of the Sports building will introduce many people to the area, putting it on the map of London, and improving its credibility as a location for further investment and a place where people want to live.

3.60 Building a reputation as a hub for SMEs in the fast-growing digital media sector, as outlined, is key for expanding the wider benefits of the development in terms of supply chain and business support, earnings and raising the profile of north Lewisham. New Bermondsey is in a good situation to achieve this through links to local further and higher education facilities, good accessibility to central London through its two stations on site and a strong track record of creative industry businesses in Lewisham.

3.61 Alongside direct employment and job brokerage, the New Bermondsey regeneration scheme will support businesses already in the area through supply chain activities in construction and operation (for example, local machine hire, business administration and support, catering etc.) and through the new residents’ spending on goods and services locally, and workers and visitors (including hotel visitors) in the completed development spending on food and drink.

3.62 A quantitative assessment was included within the Environmental Statement of the outline planning application for New Bermondsey, highlighting that:

- The new homes at New Bermondsey could generate spending of approximately £40.4million per year;
- Spending by visitors staying in the hotel could be in the region of up to £4.1million per year;
- Spending by employees could be in the region of £2million per year.

3.63 This spend will support existing businesses locally and create more opportunities for work in the area around the site to support the development. Based on average annual output per job in the retail sector per year, an annual spend in the region of £45million could support around 450 jobs in the retail and service sector surrounding the site and across Lewisham and London.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{11} Based on average output per retail employee in the South East of £100,000 per year, ONS
Community Facilities

3.64 Successful regeneration will need to be supported by public services, community and voluntary groups, and can enable this by providing a forum for these to operate, whether that be in conjunction with health space, sports facilities or in a place of worship. New Bermondsey will provide a comprehensive opportunity for local and surrounding residents to lead healthy lifestyles giving them access to community facilities in an active environment.

3.65 The Council’s Infrastructure Development Plan also outlines aspirations for the provision and maintenance of community centres, libraries, community halls and places of worship, children’s centres and child care facilities, highlighting that many of these facilities currently suffer from under-investment and are in a poor state of repair, whilst others are not “fit for purpose”. Policy in Lewisham and London supports the provision of community facilities for future population that are easily accessible, co-located, safe and secure. The New Bermondsey regeneration will include several new community spaces and a nursery/crièche, health centre and sports facilities offered to the community at local authority rates.

Sport-led Regeneration

3.66 Increasing levels of participation in sport and physical activity can contribute to improved health, lower worklessness, less crime, increased skills, stronger community identity and community cohesion. However, often sports facilities that meet local needs are not available in many deprived neighbourhoods, and a larger proportion of the population do not participate.

3.67 New Bermondsey offers a major benefit with a pioneering programme of sport-led regeneration. It aims to provide a hub of high quality, comprehensive facilities for elite athletes, as well as community-accessible sports, leisure and recreation facilities for residents and visitors.

Facilities at New Bermondsey

3.68 The scale and range of activities provided by the significant investment in sporting facilities at New Bermondsey has the potential to be a leading aspect in the regeneration of the wider area, including the redressing of current economic, social and health inequalities.

3.69 New Bermondsey will be the largest community sports facility built in London for 50 years, and provide a significant amount of floorspace dedicated to formal sport and recreation, which will include:

- A boxing gym with three rings and gym facilities; This will house the headquarters and centre of excellence for the London Amateur Boxing Association as well as a new home for 2 local and well established boxing clubs.
- 25m x 6-lane swimming pool with disabled access and learner pool;
- Fitness suite with 150 stations, dance studio and weights;
- Changing rooms, office and teaching areas;
- 4G pitch for football, ruby and hockey – also housing the Millwall Community Scheme;
- 4 multi-use sports halls for badminton, basketball, netball volleyball, handball and indoor cricket
- A 3,000 seat event arena with retractable seating (converts to 3 sports halls when not in use);
- Café, crèche, sports shop, NHS community health service, boxing museum, bar and climbing wall;
- A table tennis centre for Fusion table tennis club and regional offices for the English table tennis association; and
- A gymnastics centre.

3.70 A London base for Onside, a charity who create state of the art youth clubs, called Youth Zones, which offering a wide range of sport, art and enterprise activities. This significant level of provision of high-quality sports facilities in an accessible, legible environment of public spaces will encourage residents and visitors to live healthier lifestyles and take part in community groups and events, helping to promote social inclusion and reduce health inequalities and lower than average sports participation rates.

3.71 The proposed location of all sports facilities in a single site within the development means that clubs and facilities can be comprehensively managed to make their operation more efficient. It also allows clubs and organisations within the new indoor sports complex to utilise the 3,000 seat multi-use auditorium for major matches and tournaments, thus affording the indoor complex and its tenants the potential to attract significant events and raise the profile of Lewisham as an elite sports hub.

Clubs, Organisations and Governance

3.72 The occupation of the various facilities by clubs has been seen to respond to a significant local need, with committed uptake of space from locally and regionally significant clubs such as Lewisham Thunder (basketball), Fusion Table Tennis, Lynn Athletics Boxing Club and Downside Fisher Boxing Club. Under the guidance of the Surrey Canal Sports Foundation, and with significant financial investment from the developer (Renewal) and Sport England, the sports facility is effectively fully let to a wide range of clubs and sports organisations and linked to local schools.

3.73 The Surrey Canal Sports Foundation provides a governance structure to ensure that the facilities remain for community use at local authority rates. It will be responsible for encouraging the tenant clubs to run their programmes in the local authority and for increasing sports participation locally.

3.74 The Surrey Canal Sports Foundation, a registered charity (1141811), has been established to fund, build and run the sports facilities at New Bermondsey on a not for profit basis. The Foundation will ensure that the facilities are available to Lewisham and Southwark residents at local authority rates in perpetuity. The Foundation’s board members are:

- Steve Norris (Chair);
- Sir Steve Bullock, Elected Mayor of Lewisham;
- Cllr Peter John, Leader of Southwark Council;
- Baroness Grey-Thompson, Paralympian;
- Brendan Jarvis, Head of Real Estate for Barclays (Europe, Middle East and Africa);
- John Inverdale, Broadcaster; and
- Jordana Malik, Director of Renewal.

3.75 The Section 106 Agreement includes provision for a Sports Facilities Strategy, which will detail the operation and management of facilities from its inception. The sports facilities within the development will be
managed by the Surrey Canal Sports Foundation, in partnership with voluntary and charitable groups that will serve the communities in Lewisham and Southwark.

3.76 All of the sports and leisure facilities will be based around clubs with some Regional and National Governing Body involvement (English Table Tennis Association, London Amateur Boxing Association), and will also be accessible to local residents, clubs and schools. The co-location of the Millwall Community Trust within the facility will help to link the range of sports facilities to local people engaged by the current activities on offer.

Maximising Local Benefits - Participation

3.77 Renewal estimate that the facilities, coupled with improved accessibility to the area, have the potential to accommodate 18,000 local residents and visitors each week (at the same rates as local authority sports centres in Lewisham and Southwark).

3.78 Participation levels in disadvantaged areas and by certain sections of the community, including older people, people from black and ethnic minority groups and with disabilities, are lower than the national average. A range of important barriers prevent people from being active. These include personal attitude, beliefs and knowledge about sport and physical activity; time availability; affordability, lack of facilities, accessibility and environmental issues such as safety and the standard of the venue or facility.

3.79 Therefore, new sports facilities provided in regeneration schemes in deprived areas with low participation rates need to be promoted and managed in such a way that local people can fully access the benefits they provide. New Bermondsey has a governance structure focused on the local population through the Foundation, a pricing commitment to maintain affordability to all, and has already undertaken a detailed exercise in bringing to the site existing sports clubs with local bases and schemes targeted at improving the rate of participation in hard-to-reach groups.

3.80 Community participation led by sports clubs in the new space will be critical in maximising the benefits to local residents. It is in the interest of these occupiers to encourage participation. Lewisham Thunder, for example, are already on-site and running a number of programmes specifically targeted at groups, including wheelchair basketball sessions, basketball camps, family events, healthy living advice vocational courses, pre-and post-session study clubs, sessions to support post-natal fitness and social integration, and specific sessions for older and younger people. The ‘Hoops4Health’ programme already links with 16 local schools in the area. Similarly, Fusion Table Tennis Club are also onsite delivering coaching and competition opportunities to local young people and adults in a 16 table centre:

Figure D - Meanwhile sports use at New Bermondsey (Lewisham Thunder basketball club and Fusion table tennis club)
Linking to Employment and Skills Development

3.81 As well as increasing participation levels, a range of work opportunities from voluntary, to entry-level, to management roles are likely to be generated by this regionally significant sports facility, and the specificity of many of the roles are likely to require the uptake of new skills and potentially qualifications for people employed here – providing a significant advantage in an area with a currently low skills base and level of qualification attainment. The sports facilities will provide new jobs (approximately 300 of the 1,500 total jobs created by the development) and volunteering opportunities suited to a local population with high youth unemployment and low qualification attainment.

3.82 The jobs provided will include professional sports managers, administrators and coaches, but also a lot of flexible employment, temporary, seasonal, part-time, and low-skilled positions. These facilities, by adopting a policy of local recruitment and training will provide opportunities for a range of flexible, entry-level positions that are particularly accessible to those just entering or returning to the labour market.

3.83 A number of higher-skilled roles will also be created, directly at the facilities but also attracted as a result of improved image of the area – helping to redress the current trend for higher skilled residents to leave the area for work.

Wider Economic Benefits of Sport

3.84 Sport England highlight that sport-related employment accounts for around 2.3% of all jobs in England (400,000+ jobs), and volunteering in sport has an estimated economic value of £2.7bn nationally. This puts sport within the top 15 sectors in terms of GVA nationally – it is also a sector that grew during the recent recession, highlighting its resilience. This is set against the economic value attached to health in terms of savings on public healthcare (The annual value of health benefits from people taking part in sport is estimated at £11.2 billion [12]).

3.85 There has been broad evidence in recent history that sports venues can become the centrepiece of regeneration initiatives that seek to capture recreation, tourism and retail activity. A regionally important cluster of new sports venues and training facilities adding to the existing New Den and activities of the Millwall Community Scheme at New Bermondsey can create a new high profile sports destination for the Capital.

3.86 Investment in sporting infrastructure in cities over the past 25 years has not been primarily aimed at getting the local community involved in sport, but has instead been aimed at attracting tourists, encouraging inward investment and changing the image of urban environments experiencing deprivation and decline. In the British context, most of the urban areas following this strategy of using sport for economic regeneration have been traditionally industrial or manufacturing-based areas not normally known as major tourist destinations (e.g. Sport City in east Manchester), the decline of which has been the key driver to promoting the need for a new image and new employment opportunities.

3.87 Research[13] suggests that ‘sports tourism’ can have a significant economic impact, both directly through spending by visitors and participants to both public and elite events, and indirectly through raising footfall in an area and benefitting local retail and other commercial activities. There are several examples of venues

---

creating investment and jobs, expenditure and visitor stays by holding regionally and nationally significant events – much like will occur the new facilities at New Bermondsey.

3.88 The kind of development at New Bermondsey complements the existing visitor draw of Millwall FC, and will encourage fans to remain in the area before and after events, raising the profile of the area and encouraging local spending on food, drink, accommodation and leisure. Significant elite sporting venues, such as The New Den (currently) and the planned 3,000 seat multi-use arena (in the future) can provide an anchor for the regeneration of New Bermondsey and will be complemented by the active street scene, retail provision, hotel and open space in the development. By raising the profile of the area as a destination, and a place that presents opportunities for supporting activities e.g. via the supply chain, this will raise the attractiveness to inward investment.

3.89 Because they are growth sectors, culture, sports, arts and tourism are particularly beneficial to restructuring industrial areas that are seeking to diversify their economic bases as is the case with New Bermondsey.

Research into Regeneration Benefits of Sport

3.90 Sport England produce a database of academic research into the value of sport across a number of themes via the ‘Value of Sport Monitor’. This includes detailed examples of site-and development-specific studies into the extra income generated in areas that provide new sports facilities, and other non-monetary benefits for advancing regeneration. While it is not appropriate to superimpose effects in other areas at other times on to New Bermondsey, the findings generally suggest that the area around New Bermondsey can broadly expect the following benefits from delivering a large, mixed use, high quality, accessible sports facility:

Table 3 – Research from Sport England ‘Value of Sport Monitor’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Reduction and Community Safety</th>
<th>Economic Impact and Regeneration of Local Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation leads to reduced crime, drug use and ASB, especially effective in rehabilitating young offenders</td>
<td>Sport-related sectors are highly productive in terms of GVA, are resilient to economic downturns, create a range of jobs with different skills requirements, generate supply chain benefits and economic benefits through volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports clubs and programmes targeted at hard-to-reach groups reduces crime and ASB rates in those groups</td>
<td>The economic impact of major events at venues creates local spending, accommodation demand and indirect employment and supply chain benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local events and smaller events also generate footfall and income, often if they are in locations that are accessible and have secondary facilities to maximise secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education and Lifelong Learning

- Indirectly, public healthcare costs are greater in areas with lower rates of participation (e.g. 20, 21)
- Sport participation, and engagement in sport through schools and youth clubs, can be an effective way of learning life-skills and improving academic achievement (e.g. 22, 23)
- Sports offer different avenues to qualifications and employment, and opportunities for work experience and voluntary activity for young people (e.g. 24)
- Multi-functional sports centres with integrated facilities for clubs can be an effective way for engaging disaffected young people through both participation and also other educational and social support structures – some of these currently exist through the Millwall Community Scheme (e.g. 25)

Physical and Psychological Health and Wellbeing

- Increased participation in sport can reduce incidence of preventable health problems including cardiovascular illness, mental health problems, particularly for those who would usually find it difficult to access facilities (e.g. 26, 27, 28)
- Having an accessible range of sports services locally also increases perceptions and awareness of wellbeing and the value of a healthy lifestyle among residents and visitors (e.g. 29, 30)

Social Cohesion and Participation

- Successful community-based schemes can engage hard-to-reach groups in the local community, develop peer relationships and key life skills and citizenship principles, encourage volunteering and link amateur and professional activity if delivered in a comprehensive mixed-use environment (e.g. 31, 32, 33)
- Well-managed and governed, publically accessible facilities can break down barriers to participation for minority groups including older people, BME and cultural groups, disabled people and young people (e.g. 34, 35)

20 Wilson, R (2006) The Economic Impact of Four Local Swimming Events, Managing Leisure, 11 (1), 57-70
Millwall Community Trust – Lions Centre

3.91 Millwall Community Trust have been active in promoting social inclusion in the local community via the Lions Centre for over 25 years, providing coaching sessions with community groups and schools among other educational and sports-based activities.

3.92 The existing Lions Community Centre will be re-housed in new, purpose-built accommodation within the sports centre. The Lions Community Centre is home to the Millwall Community Scheme, which provides opportunities for the local communities of Lewisham and Southwark to take part in sport, learn new skills, improve their health and find employment.

3.93 As part of the multi-faceted, regionally significant sports facilities, the Millwall Community Scheme has an opportunity to enhance its already excellent community activities (including training of sports coaches, running community clubs, delivering schools coaching sessions and organising community activities) locally and can benefit from highly accessible and top quality facilities on its doorstep.

Faith Centre

3.94 North Lewisham is a diverse area, with a significant representation across a number of different faiths and beliefs. The largest represented group is ‘Christian’ at over half of all residents in New Cross (Census, 2011), with a significant representation of residents without a religion, and a concentration of Muslim residents.

3.95 Through community consultation, Renewal identified that there are over sixty faith groups in unsuitable premises within a quarter of a mile of the New Bermondsey site – there is a huge growth in demand for religious facilities in the area. This was corroborated by the Council’s Faith Officer, who identified that Faith Groups in the local area face difficulties in finding suitable property, acquiring leases and purchasing facilities.

3.96 As the first phase of the development it is critical to deliver a facility that is multi-functional, accessible to all members of the community and meets a number of basic needs, not just for faith but for voluntary and community groups, residents associations and clubs. As such, the facility will provide an auditorium, meeting rooms, café and informal area to ensure that all groups can be accommodated for and have space to operate.

3.97 Given the demand for facilities, and the diverse nature of the area, it is key that any occupier of the facility is sensitive and understanding of the needs of the diverse local community and willing to play a role in the community. In selecting an occupier – from an initial list of 100+ denominations – Renewal identified that there should be a strong local connection to London, a track-record of community initiatives, and an inclusive stance in terms of age, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, disability and beliefs. Based on these criteria, Hillsong were chosen as the preferred occupier, and both parties have shown their commitment to the local community by Renewal facilitating and Hillsong occupying the temporary occupation of part of the site prior to the completion of the new faith and community facility in Phase 1.

3.98 Hillsong are a Christian denomination, with an established base in London and South East England, already having strong congregations in the West End, Kent and Surrey. The congregation at the temporary facilities at New Bermondsey is already 600-strong and growing. In addition to regular services, Hillsong operate a number of community initiatives including:
• ‘Greenlight’ – a social justice initiative that sees a team of skilled volunteers go out onto the streets of London in the evenings on a medical van to offer minimal invasive medical care, and provide advice to rough sleepers;

• ‘I Care Revolution’ – the community youth arm of the church, which engages young people to overcome issues of deprivation;

• ‘Elderly Outreach’ - Hillsong London partners with Community Centres for the elderly. At The Platt Centre, Putney the church assists those who attend the centre with everyday practical needs, such as home and garden maintenance, grocery shopping and transport. The church host tea parties and social events to help make the elderly feel valued and connected;

• ‘Leadership Masterclass’ - A 14 week training program to develop and equip individuals for leadership; and

• ‘Financial Confidence Training’ - A free, financial course for those who desire to improve their personal budgeting skills and knowledge. The training is delivered to small groups with opportunity for one-to-one follow up session with a personal coach.

Additionally, the faith centre at New Bermondsey will house the South London Multi-faith and Multi-cultural resources centre previously housed at Kilmorie School, Forest Hill and currently in store in the Renewal offices.

This kind of facility will potentially play an important role in meeting the needs of local communities through primarily providing dedicated space for a faith group. The centre will potentially act as a base for a variety of temporary, part-time and permanent community services and will provide significant community services, many of which are aimed at or are particularly accessible to vulnerable people.

Safeguarding and Enhancing Millwall FC

Millwall Football Club is an important asset to Lewisham, and a vital part of the cultural and community infrastructure of the wider area. Throughout the planning application process and beyond, Renewal have maintained an open line of communication with the club and have sought to identify and mitigate any negative effects.

Through the development of New Bermondsey, Millwall FC will benefit from:

• External cladding of the New Den, to improve the exterior of the stadium in-line with the re-development of surrounding areas on the site;

• Re-provision of dedicated car parking facilities for matchday and non-matchday events and the re-provision of coach parking facilities for event days;

• The provision of outside broadcasting facilities;

• An attractive and vastly improved setting for the club, including a new boulevard running alongside the Barry Kitchener stand, Stadium Avenue;

• The replacement of the groundsperson’s accommodation; and
- Sensitive management of the potential relocation of the Memorial Garden - A legal agreement (via Section 106) has also been put in place to confirm that Phase 4 of the construction of the development will not be started until either a) it is confirmed that the existing Memorial Garden on the site does not need to be relocated; or b) that a strategy is in place to replace and relocate the existing garden sensitively.

3.103 In considering Millwall FC’s long history in the area, Renewal has worked in partnership with Millwall FC in order to create an improved setting for the Stadium, with improved access, new transport links and better facilities for fans and visitors.

3.104 The comprehensive regeneration of the New Bermondsey site takes into account the long-term future of the football club including any future requirement for stadium improvement and expansion as well as transport infrastructure and allows for an increase in capacity of the Stadium from 20,000 to 26,500 if sought.

**Health and Wellbeing**

3.105 A central tenet of New Bermondsey’s vision is to tackle lifestyle driven health problems through a range of measures – both directly through the provision of a multi-functional health facility and high-quality, accessible sports facilities on-site, and indirectly through the provision of housing, open space, jobs and improved permeability and connectivity.

3.106 At present, New Cross and Lewisham suffer from a number of health inequalities – both in terms of public health indicators such as higher mortality rates and shorter life expectancy than London average, cardiovascular disease and obesity, and wider determinants such as participation in sport and physical activity.

3.107 New Bermondsey will include dedicated space for a new healthcare facility, with specification of services agreed through consultation with organisations responsible for the commissioning of healthcare facilities in Lewisham and Southwark. While the facilities are due to be delivered in the later stages of the development, continual engagement has been made with local public health authorities, and it is anticipated that the centre could include medical and dental surgeries, care in the community facilities, a pharmacy and a specialism in sports medicine including diagnostics and rehabilitation.

3.108 As outlined above, New Bermondsey will also include a wide range of accessible sports facilities.

*Wider Determinants of Health*

3.109 Regeneration of New Bermondsey meets key target areas for reducing health inequality as outlined in Marmot Review of health inequalities.36

3.110 Primarily, the ‘wider determinants of health’ include those factors not directly related to a health condition – but lead to health benefits through, for example, providing new housing, community facilities and local services, and opportunities for physical activity and outdoor recreation on health arising from the Development, as directed by guidance from the London Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU)37.

---


The following categories are identified where New Bermondsey will have an impact on wider determinants of health and reducing health inequalities:

- **Housing** - Access to affordable, decent standard housing is essential to public health, particularly for vulnerable groups, for example disabled people and people with long-term health issues or illness limiting movement, older or young people, and low-income groups. New Bermondsey provides a significant addition to local housing stock in a range of tenures and sizes, meeting local need.

- **Reduced Unemployment and Access to Work** - Access to employment and being in work can increase health and well-being, and make it easier to pursue a healthy lifestyle, with income being one of the strongest indicators of health and disease in public health research. Unemployment, conversely, is often related to an increased risk of poor physical and mental health and premature death. By creating a range of jobs and actively linking local people to opportunities through committed brokerage schemes, New Bermondsey will help to redress employment deprivation locally.

- **Community Facilities and Public Services** - The inclusion of public services and infrastructure is paramount as part of new developments in order to build strong, sustainable and cohesive communities. Lack of availability and accessibility to municipal services such as libraries, health facilities, schools and childcare and community centres and social support can have a negative social impact on communities and affect both physical and mental health. New Bermondsey offers a significant quantity, range and access of community facilities as outlined to increase close access and participation and advance social interaction between and within groups in a safe environment.

- **Early Years and Access to Education** – The link between education and a good environment for children to grow up in, and public health outcomes is reflected in the quality of a Development. A child’s physical, social, and cognitive development during the early years strongly influences their school-readiness and educational attainment, economic participation and health. New Bermondsey will include nursery/crèche facilities, and a contribution to mitigating the effect of residents of the development on the ability of local schools to meet demand for places.

- **Physical Activity and Outdoor Recreation** - Reducing dependence on vehicles and providing secure, convenient and attractive public open space can lead to more physical exercise participation in local residents, and reduce the risk of negative health impacts associated with a sedentary lifestyle. Generally, good access to high quality environments for physical activity is associated with an increase in the frequency of its use. It is important that housing and streetscape design are considered as part of neighbourhoods that contribute towards building social relationships as positive contributions toward health. The New Bermondsey regeneration will substantially improve access within and through the area, provides legible, accessible and well-maintained open space and play space for children and a world class outlet for physical exercise.

- **Crime Reduction and Community Safety** - Crime related injury is a significant public health problem in itself. In addition, the perception and fear of crime reduces social solidarity, and has an adverse psychological impact which can lead to mental health issues and subsequent physical illness associated with a lack of access to services and facilities, a lack of social interaction, and a sedentary lifestyle, which can disproportionately affect vulnerable people such as the elderly or disabled or people experiencing hate-crime including gay people and ethnic groups. By enhancing the physical environment and providing an active street scene and built-in measures such as lighting and CCTV,
with numerous community facilities, New Bermondsey will help to reduce the perception of crime and improve the perception of safety for all groups.

- **Resource Minimisation and Sustainability** - Climate change, and the effects of climate change, will have significant implications for the public health of communities at all scales. The design and construction aspects of the scheme can help to mitigate both the impacts on residents of the Development, and the wider community. New Bermondsey will build on locally existing capacity – SELCHP currently provides power, but will also provide heat to all homes created in the development.

**Overall Public Benefit**

3.112 New Bermondsey represents an opportunity to address the socio-economic challenges outlined above by delivering a comprehensive mixed use regeneration project that can provide a step-change in both the perception of the area and the realities faced by local residents. The offer of increased accessibility, jobs and business space accessible to local people and fostering entrepreneurship and skills development, and new homes in a range of tenures can provide major public benefits to existing residents as well as occupiers of new space in the future. This is set in the context of a regionally-significant range and quantum of sports facilities, and other beneficial and inclusive community facilities and accessible urban environment.
4 EQUALITY AND PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS

4.1 This section considers the regeneration benefits of the scheme in the context of their effect on equalities groups, or protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010.

4.2 A full analysis of baseline data, using publicly accessible datasets for a number of socio-economic indicators including all protected characteristics, is included at PART 2 of this report for reference.

Construction Activity

4.3 The 15 year construction period has the potential to lead to local effects on amenity, disruption to access and services, and environmental effects for protected groups, particularly older people, disabled people and those with long-term life-limiting illness.

4.4 This will be a temporary effect, and will be mitigated through construction activities being subject to a Site Wide Code of Construction Practice (COCP) which will be prepared in consultation with the Council and is committed to in a Section 106 Agreement. These elements will include the following environmental management control measures to minimise and where possible negate adverse effects, meeting required standards as identified in the consented outline planning application and committed to be requirements and obligations:

- Dust suppression and air quality controls;
- Noise and vibration techniques;
- Waste management and recycling strategy;
- Results of site investigations and proposals to deal with environmental issues;
- Site management requirements to deal with environmental issues; and
- Construction logistic proposals.

4.5 The impact on amenity for particularly sensitive groups will therefore be mitigated by monitoring the effects of the construction activities, identifying where unacceptable impacts may occur and implementing appropriate schemes to reduce the impacts.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>Temporary construction noise, disruption to access and services can disproportionately affect older people, disabled people and those with long-term life-limiting illness if not managed adequately.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Bermondsey | Any potential negative effects will be mitigated by:  
- Stringent monitoring and implementing environmental management measures as secured in the COCP and Section 106, including:  
  - Dust suppression and air quality controls;  
  - Noise and vibration techniques;  
  - Waste management and recycling strategy;  
  - Results of site investigations and proposals to deal with environmental issues;  
  - Site management requirements to deal with environmental issues; and  
  - Construction logistic proposals. |
**Housing**

4.6 Access to affordable, decent standard housing is essential for building sustainable communities and reducing pressure on housing waiting lists, offering more opportunities for vulnerable groups (e.g. older people, younger people, low-income households) to improve their standard of living. At present, the local area faces problems in terms of overcrowding, a long housing waiting list and unaffordability.

4.7 Adding affordable, well-designed housing is also essential to reducing health inequalities, particularly for vulnerable groups, for example elderly or young people, and low-income groups. The Marmot Review into Health Inequalities (2010) identified that bad housing conditions – which also includes factors such as homelessness, temporary accommodation, overcrowding, insecurity, and housing in poor physical condition – constitute a risk to health, and this is most likely to affect the more vulnerable groups in society.

**Accessible Homes**

4.8 The area around New Bermondsey has a high proportion of residents claiming Employment Support Allowance due to disability (6.8% of local residents – May 2015); and according to the 2011 Census, around 6% of all residents in New Cross identified that day-to-day activities were limited a lot by long-term illness or disability.

4.9 All new homes at New Bermondsey will meet Building Regulations 2010 Part M (2&3) Schedule 1 requirements and be built to Lifetime Homes standards as a minimum, with at least 10% of all units provided across all tenures throughout the Proposed Development will be wheelchair accessible or designed so as to be easily adaptable for wheelchair users or people with impaired mobility, and will accord with the standards set out in the South East London Housing Partnership Wheelchair Homes Design Guide (2009) or other guidance/standards as agreed with the local planning authority over time, including the London Plan Policy 3.8, the Mayor’s Housing SPG, and the Draft Interim Housing SPG (2015). The Draft Interim Housing SPG requires that from October 2015 90% of homes should meet building regulation M4 (2) – ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’.

4.10 The approved range of dwelling sizes and tenure mix (private, intermediate and social rented) and commitments to meeting accessibility standards, and the provision of wheelchair accessible and easily adaptable housing – controlled by the planning conditions and obligations agreed as part of the planning permission granted – provides a positive benefit in terms of housing accessibility and accords with requirements of Lewisham’s Core Strategy and housing policies in the London Plan.

4.11 The design standards will anticipate the needs of current and future residents and visitors with disabilities, older people with limited mobility, and other groups such as parents with children.

**Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>New homes should account for different accessibility needs, including those shared by disabled people, older people, people with limited mobility, and parents with children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Bermondsey | New Bermondsey will provide a significant uplift in homes, that will:  
- Meet meet Building Regulations 2010 Part M (2&3) Schedule 1 and be built to Lifetime Homes standards as a minimum;  
- Meet the requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings in the Draft Interim Housing SPG;  
- Include at least 10% of homes across all tenures that are wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable. |
designed according with current and future standards so as to be easily adaptable for wheelchair users or people with impaired mobility;
These elements are secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

Existing Residential Premises

4.12 There is currently one remaining residential unit within the site (Bridge House), the freehold of which is owned by an external investor and which is currently in private rented use as a House of Multiple Occupation. The Developer and the owner of Bridge House have agreed Heads of Terms for the purchase of Bridge House. Exchange and completion is imminent, and therefore it is very unlikely that the CPO will be required for Bridge House. Once completed, the current tenants will relocate to another property owned and maintained by the current owner, facilitated by the owner.

4.13 If the Developer does not acquire Bridge House, there is potential for a negative impact on these residents if they include people with protected characteristics and/or dependencies on their residential location (for example if children are in the local school; or if residents are disabled and require care or facilities in this residence). Given that New Bermondsey will bring forward a significant number of new, accessible homes (many likely to be in the private rented sector), and given rates of background turnover in the private rented sector, this impact is likely to be minimal.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>The development will require the removal of one HMO (Bridge House HMO) from the site, and the relocation of its residents who may share protected characteristics and/or dependencies on their residential location (for example if children are in the local school; or if residents are disabled and require care or facilities in this residence). Measures are in place to relocate the current tenants to another property owned by the current owner of Bridge House once the purchase has been completed, facilitated by the owner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Bermondsey | New Bermondsey will:  
• Bring forward a significant uplift in new homes in the area – with up to 2,400 new homes on the site.  
• |

Tenures and Allocations

4.14 Social rented units in a range of sizes will be provided at New Bermondsey, with the allocation of these dwellings subject to the usual legal protections on equalities as applied by the Local Authority or commissioned housing management company under the Housing Act and Lewisham’s Housing Allocation Scheme Policy (October 2012). Housing allocations in Lewisham are intended to prioritise vulnerable groups including people with medical needs and disabilities, or those moving due to racial, sexual or other harassment.
While not discriminating in favour of any particular group, the allocation of social housing to reflect need can be expected to offer significant benefits to children, pregnant women, and also Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) residents (groups identified as experiencing disproportionately high rates of housing need). By the nature of its location and the ethnic make-up of the local population, provision of social rented housing at New Bermondsey would be expected to have a beneficial effect on alleviating the housing problems faced by some residents with protected characteristics.

The latest available lettings data\textsuperscript{38} shows that 36% of all people placed in social rented accommodation in Lewisham from 2002-7 were children (compared to approximately 20% of the general population of the borough who are children), and that 50% of all lettings were to families. As such, provision of new social housing will be expected to benefit children, pregnant women, disabled residents and families. Lettings policies prioritise the re-housing of families living in temporary, unfit, overcrowded or unsuitable accommodation.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>The tenure mix of new homes can help to ensure benefits to equalities groups and those with protected characteristics including disabled people, older people, BAME groups, younger people and other vulnerable groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Bermondsey</td>
<td>New Bermondsey will deliver a significant uplift of 2,400 new homes, which will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be in a range of tenures including affordable tenures that are particularly sought after and beneficial to vulnerable people, families, those in housing need and groups with protected characteristics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include social rented homes that will be subject to legal protections (including those in the Housing Act and Lewisham Council’s allocations policies) on lettings so as not to discriminate against any groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment

The needs of unemployed and economically inactive residents locally differs from other areas, partly due to the demographic profile – there are a higher number of students, a younger population with shorter duration of JSA claims, and a different profile of occupational skills, including between men and women.

Some protected groups may be unevenly represented in terms of barriers to accessing work, skills and qualification level, language and cultural factors, family requirements and need for flexible and/or part-time working. For example, in Lewisham and London, BME groups account for around a third of all JSA claimants. In Lewisham, the breakdown of BME JSA claimants is weighted towards ‘Black and Black British’ and ‘Asian’ groups compared to the London average. There are also inequalities in terms of gross earnings between Lewisham and London, including between men and women – with earnings lower in Lewisham than London average for both sexes.

When New Bermondsey is operational, with a mixture of retail, commercial, hospitality, community and healthcare uses, it will offer a range of different jobs with different skill levels, and there will be many uses that will provide opportunities for local people requiring entry-level jobs. It is anticipated that there will be around 2,000 new jobs created by the development, compared to 366 currently on-site.

\textsuperscript{38} CORE Lettings, National Housebuilding Federation
4.20 The retail and hotel floorspace will be particularly important for local employment as it provides many opportunities that are suitable for people without high level qualifications. Such employment is therefore of particular benefit to local deprived areas, with a high proportion of BAME residents, unemployed residents and people looking for flexible, entry-level work including people returning to work. In addition, research by the GLA (2006) found that retail jobs in London go disproportionately to a number of key equalities groups, including young people, women, and BAME people.

4.21 As detailed in the outline Planning Application, the benefits of a large construction project such as this will be enhanced by tapping into jobs brokerage schemes for local unemployed people, and by fostering links with young people in local education institutions to give them the opportunity to learn important skills while being offered the chance to earn money close to where they live. To this end, Renewal have consulted with the Council’s Local Labour and Business Co-ordinator and prior to the Outline Planning Application met with the New Cross-based 170 Community Project who run training and access to employment courses for the local community, the New Cross Gate NDC and Action 4 Employment (A4e) about ways in which the scheme can enable local residents to access the job opportunities at New Bermondsey.

4.22 Additionally, the proposals for New Bermondsey include a commitment, via Section 106, to fully participate in the Local Labour and Business Scheme, and to achieve a target of at least 50% employment of local people and businesses through a Local Employment Strategy which sets out reasonable endeavours to promote and recruit employees, contractors and suppliers from Lewisham during the construction and operational phase of the development to ensure that benefits are felt locally.

4.23 As such, the proposals offer significant benefit to protected groups through the creation of jobs that meet skills and operational needs, and these benefits are ensured and enhanced through committed brokerage schemes tailored to local ‘hard to reach’ groups.

**Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>Creating new jobs provides social and economic benefits to current and future residents and can be enhanced to improve employment and skills development opportunities of all equalities groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Bermondsey</strong></td>
<td>New Bermondsey is a long-term project that will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create up to 700 FTE jobs in a range of sectors in the construction phase;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create and support up to 1,500 jobs in a range of business, retail, service and other sectors when the development is complete - This is a significant number and range of jobs including different skill level and flexibility, suitable for different groups and needs of protected groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure the continuation of jobs at Millwall FC and the Lions Community Centre within the site;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commit to brokerage schemes via Section 106 Agreement to match jobs with local employment and skills needs;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Existing Tenants

4.24 Displacement of current occupiers of industrial units and commercial activity on the site through CPO and other purchase may lead to equalities impacts where/if business owners include those with protected characteristics and are required to move off-site and lose local ties.

4.25 Renewal manage all of the existing units in-house and have made a policy of informing all of the existing tenants of the planning application process, and the likely timescales for the relevant phase that their units fall within to ensure that they can manage their business and property matters. In addition, the phasing of the construction from south to north over the 10 - 12 year construction period will mean that not all existing employment will be lost at phase 1, and will remain on-site until demolition of that specific phase.

4.26 Renewal have, and will continue to engage with both tenants of the existing estate and the estate to be acquired to inform them of the proposed time frame of development. All details of discussions with owners and tenants relating to relocation are included in the confidential Acquisition & Relocation Report. Prior to development commencing, Renewal will provide information on the scheme website and in person to the affected businesses and residents enabling them to easily search for suitable alternative premises locally. As part of the Section 106 Agreement, a Relocation Strategy has been shaped in connection with the relocation of occupiers at the site. This Strategy sets out the level of support to be provided, and includes:

- A relocation page on the website connecting to active commercial agents and highlighting alternative premises;
- Advice on negotiating terms;
- Flexible tenancies to facilitate easy relocation as opportunities arise;
- Identification of opportunities to relocate tenants from early phases of the development into vacant units in later phases;
- Liaison with owners of local industrial estates to identify opportunities for businesses to relocate in the area; and
- A Masterplan progress newsletter to all occupiers of existing non-residential properties within the site.

4.27 As such, the effect on protected groups is likely to avoid inequality in decision making, meet legislative standards for compulsory purchase, and offer support in finding appropriate replacement workspace.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>The development will require the removal of current occupiers of industrial units on the site, which may include business owners who are dependent on local ties and with protected characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Bermondsey | Throughout the planning application process, Renewal has
- Engaged with local business owners to update them on the progress of the scheme, and make them aware of the long lead-in times for each phase of construction;
- Commissioned research into the significant availability of light industrial business premises locally that could be suitable alternative accommodation for businesses within the site; and
- Developed a Relocation Strategy and associated measures listed above, secured |
Accessibility, Public Space and Play Space

4.28 Due to its current land use and poor physical environment, the site is relatively inaccessible. The perception of crime and safety is a concern to all groups, and groups with protected characteristics (including children and young people, older people, disabled people, BME and faith groups, LGBT people and other protected characteristics may be or feel particularly vulnerable).

4.29 An improved physical environment, with design measures including active frontage, CCTV and lighting allied to significantly increased footfall will lead to a reduced perception of crime and improved perception of safety will therefore be beneficial to these groups.

4.30 Modern design standards integrated into the New Bermondsey development offer significant improvements in accessibility, and would benefit potential future residents or visitors with disabilities, older people with limited mobility, and other groups such as parents with children. Following local consultation, New Bermondsey will also respond to identified local need by providing 5 new public squares and spending £1m on regenerating the adjacent Bridgehouse Meadows.

4.31 A Section 106 Agreement is in place to ensure that the occupation of the residential units matches the completion and access to open space, to ensure adequate provision for new residents throughout the construction period.

Playable Space

4.32 New Cross currently performs poorly in terms of health inequalities relating to children, with high levels of obesity and low levels of physical activity. Good quality, safe, accessible playable space for children of all ages is critical in redressing inequalities and promoting good health and social interaction.

4.33 New Bermondsey will provide a total of 5,330 sqm of formal playable space (within a total area of over 13,000 sqm of private communal space and around 5,600-6,600 sqm of publicly accessible open space in Bolina Gardens, Stadium Square, Stadium avenue, Orion square and Station square), together with newly revitalised playable space in Bridgehouse Meadows, there is adequate provision of playable space to accommodate the estimated child yield of the development itself and be of significant benefit to children in surrounding areas.

4.34 The quantity of play space provision committed to at New Bermondsey meets the GLA’s requirements as outlined in the London Plan and relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance. As such, the proposed development is considered to offer significant benefits to groups with protected characteristics including children and families.

---

40 GLA (2012) Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG
Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>The level to which a development is safe, open and accessible, and has adequate facilities for children (play space) needs to be taken into account with regard to all equalities groups and protected characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Bermondsey</td>
<td>When complete, New Bermondsey will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open up a currently inaccessible and impermeable area to the public;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create an improved physical environment, modern design standards and increased footfall to benefit disabled people and people with limited mobility, improved perception of safety for all groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include 5 new public squares and £1m regeneration of Bridgehouse Meadows that will include improved provision of playable space for new and existing local residents in-line with GLA standards;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Facilities / Public Services

4.35 A priority in the provision of community facilities is to ensure services can be accessed by “hard to reach” groups, those members of the community who may be less likely to pro-actively seek access to community services.

4.36 Provision of and access to good quality public services, including healthcare, assembly, leisure and recreation facilities can help to create an active street environment, and can tackle existing health inequalities by making it easier to live a healthy lifestyle.

Sports Facilities

4.37 Health inequality is a significant issue in north Lewisham, with incidence of physical activity, participation in sport and preventable life-limiting illness showing a substantial deviation from London averages.

4.38 Renewal has been working in partnership with the Council, Sport England and National Governing Bodies of sport seeking to address the lack of sporting facilities in the north of the borough whereby participation levels have been severely restricted through the lack of facilities available. The intention is to provide sporting facilities to serve all groups in the local community, and also young people via local schools, local clubs, the Governing Bodies and the wider areas of South East London in order to help redress health and social inequalities and improve activity locally.

4.39 The quantity and quality of sports facilities provided will help to raise interest and access to sports participation, helping to reduce preventable health inequalities such as high levels of obesity and cardiovascular illness. Through partnership within with the NHS, programmes will aim to improve participation in sports by hard-to-reach groups, including young people, and will combine sport with advice on fitness, nutrition and healthy lifestyles.

4.40 The Surrey Canal Sports Foundation will manage the facilities on a not for profit basis to ensure that access and price is in-line with other public sports facilities in Lewisham and Southwark, in order to provide equal access for all members of the community and not discriminating against those with protected characteristics.

4.41 Presently, Lewisham Thunder basketball club are occupying a unit on the site and will take up space in the completed development. As a local club, Lewisham Thunder runs a variety of initiatives with local schools.
and community groups, including schemes specifically designed for enabling disabled people, older people and other protected groups to participate in sport. This activity will be actively encouraged by the Surrey Canal Sports Foundation in order to maximise the benefits for all local residents. Similarly, Fusion Table Tennis are onsite and delivering coaching and competition opportunities to local people. Fusion will have a dedicated table tennis centre within the completed development.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>Provision of sports facilities and operating capacity for national and local clubs and organisations should reflect the needs of equalities groups and protected characteristics including younger people, older people, BME groups, disabled people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **New Bermondsey** | New Bermondsey will include significant sports facilities that bring a number of benefits to residents and visitors, including:  
  - Reducing health inequalities by increasing opportunities for participation in a range of different activities accessible to all;  
  - Promoting participation by good management, affordable pricing and a range of local and national clubs and occupiers who run activities targeted towards groups with specific needs; and  
  - Increasing engagement in sport and activity especially with hard-to-reach and disadvantaged groups. |

**Faith Centre**

4.42 North Lewisham is a diverse area, with a significant representation across a number of different faiths and beliefs. The largest represented group is ‘Christian’ at over half of all residents in New Cross (Census, 2011), with a significant representation of residents without a religion, and a concentration of Muslim residents.

4.43 The first phase of the New Bermondsey development will deliver a faith centre. Renewal identified that any occupier should have a strong local connection to London, a track-record of community initiatives, and an inclusive stance in terms of age, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and beliefs in order that the facilities within the centre – those directly related to faith and not – are fully inclusive and accessible to groups with protected characteristics.

4.44 As reported, a significant and detailed consultation and shortlisting process was undertaken to identify the right occupier for the facility, Hillsong Church. Hillsong are currently operating a church in interim facilities on the site.

4.45 Additionally, the faith centre at New Bermondsey will house open community facilities (café and meeting rooms) and an important multi-faith, multi-cultural resource facility previously housed in Kilmorie School, providing positive benefits in the context of the requirements of the Equalities Act 2010 by fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, and advancing equality of opportunity.
Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>The provision of a large faith centre (Christian denomination) with meeting facilities and café; re-provision of Lewisham’s multi-faith, multi-cultural research facility on site should reflect the needs of all equalities groups and not disadvantage any groups or people with protected characteristics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Bermondsey | This significant facility at the Surrey anal site will provide significant benefits through:  
• Providing open and accessible meeting space for people and community groups;  
• Providing a home for a significant multi-faith teaching and learning resource previously housed in Kilmorie School to promote and foster good relations between equalities groups and those with and without protected characteristics; and  
• Management and operation by an organization chosen thorough detailed consultation who operate a number of community engagement initiatives with vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups. |

**Childcare, Education and Healthcare**

4.46 The completion of a significant number of new homes at New Bermondsey will lead to an increase in demand for school places locally. As part of the socio-economic assessment, a population modelling exercise was undertaken to estimate the total number of families and children, by age, anticipated to live within the completed development, set against the current level of school place provision.

4.47 In recognition of the effect of raising demand for education places, Renewal has committed to a Primary Education contribution through the Section 106 Agreement within the outline planning application towards the creation of additional primary school places in Lewisham’s Primary Pupil Place Planning Locality 5. The contribution is based on identified additional need generated by the development, and will be delivered prior to the occupation of 950 units on the site. Lewisham Council will use this fund to expand school capacity to meet demand and ensure the equality of opportunity for children’s education is maintained.

4.48 The development will also create additional demand for younger children and childcare facilities to support families with pre-school age children. The proposals for the New Bermondsey development include the provision of a nursery/crièche prior to the completion of 50% of the residential units.

4.49 Overall, the creation of additional homes and therefore occupation of the site by families with young children will create an impact on education and childcare capacity locally. Through agreed financial contributions, this capacity impact would be mitigated. Additionally, by creating affordable housing, on-site childcare and community facilities and significant open space and playable space in a safe, accessible environment, New Bermondsey can help to support the needs of young families and children.

4.50 The later phases of the New Bermondsey development will include a multi-use healthcare facility with GP services, sports injury and other services designed to meet the needs of the local community and complement other uses on the site (specifically the sports centre). Consultation will be continued with the PCT and relevant authorities to ensure that the public facilities within this centre are fully inclusive and accessible to all local residents.
Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>The demand for healthcare (e.g. GP services) and education (schools and pre-school childcare) generated by a new development must be taken into account to identify any negative effect on children and younger people, children and younger people, older people, disabled people, people with long-term limiting health problems and limited mobility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Bermondsey | As part of the development of New Bermondsey, there will be:  
- A Section 106 commitment to education contribution and provision of nursery/créche on the site to mitigate any negative effect on local education capacity caused by new residents in the area;  
- An on-site healthcare facility within the development to improve service delivery in the wider area, likely to include GP services and facilities complementary to sports facilities. Consultation is on-going with PCT and relevant stakeholders to ensure facilities meet needs of the population.  
- Affordable housing, on-site childcare and community facilities and significant open space and playable space in a safe, accessible environment to support the needs of young families and children. |

Millwall Community Trust

4.51 The Millwall Community Trust have been active in promoting social inclusion in the local community via the Lions Centre for over 25 years, providing coaching sessions with community groups and schools among other educational and sports-based activities.

4.52 There is an identified need for active intervention in participation in sport and community activities locally, with high levels of child poverty and health inequality, particularly in terms of obesity, along with social issues such as crime prevailing. Sports related programmes, such as those run by the Millwall Community Scheme, are particularly useful in reaching young men who often do not engage with other community programmes.

4.53 A key element of New Bermondsey will be to include and enhance the work done by the Millwall Community Trust in reaching young people in North Lewisham. By making the area more accessible and active the development will raise the profile of the current activities and safeguard its future by providing dedicated space in the sports facilities on-site.

4.54 Prior to any D2 use on the site (or Phase 2 of the construction plan), the Lions Centre Relocation Strategy will be submitted to the Council. Following this, the replacement facility will be opened to the public prior to the demolition of the existing Lions Centre, in order to minimise community disruption to the protected groups who use the facilities and maintain the quality and quantity of services.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential effect on equalities groups or protected characteristics</th>
<th>As part of the development, the Millwall Community Trust will be moved from the Lions Centre into the new sports facilities at New Bermondsey. The Trust have provided significant facilities and activities that are important to many younger people, hard-to-reach groups and equalities groups in the local area for over 25 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Bermondsey</td>
<td>Renewal recognise the important work that the Millwall Community Trust does. As part of the New Bermondsey development:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Trust will be re-located in improved facilities within the wider sports offer at New Bermondsey, safeguarding and improving its potential to keep engaging with local people and minimizing disruption to the services provided;

Increased accessibility and visibility will help to raise the profile of the Millwall Community Trust

Transparency & Public Involvement

4.55 The following section identifies how the developer has engaged community groups, statutory consultees and local residents throughout the planning application process and beyond, specifically involving equalities groups.
5 COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

5.1 Renewal recognise the importance of placing the local community, including residents and businesses, community and voluntary groups, at the centre of the New Bermondsey development. As part of the planning application in 2011, and since outline consent was granted, Renewal has carried out extensive consultation over a number of years both in respect of the policies and principles underpinning the Scheme through to detailed proposals. The consultation process was conducted in an open, transparent and inclusive way with the help of partners at Lewisham Council and led by the key characteristic of the local community and its socio-economic profile in order to fully incorporate the views and concerns of groups sharing protected characteristics and those without these characteristics.

5.2 Extensive consultation was undertaken by Renewal throughout the pre-application consultation process and meetings took place with a wide range of local groups and all relevant stakeholders. Overall Renewal promoted the scheme to 76,074 community members, and spoke to approximately 4,825 people directly up until the Outline Application was submitted in February 2011.

Pre-application Consultation

5.3 Up until submission of the Outline Planning Application in February 2011, consultation activities consisted of:

13 pre-consultation meetings: August – November 2009

5.4 Meetings were held with elected Members, MPs, London Assembly Members, the Mayor and Cabinet and representatives from local organisations including the Police, Lewisham College, Goldsmiths College, local schools, Millwall FC, the Millwall Community Scheme and Lewisham Hospital.

Lewisham People’s Day: July 2010

5.5 The Scheme was launched to the public at Lewisham People’s Day on the 10th July 2010. People’s Day is Lewisham’s longest running community festival attracting over 30,000 people, with the majority attending from the north of the borough.

Lewington Centre exhibition

5.6 Following People’s Day, Renewal held a more detailed three day exhibition at the Lewington Centre on the Silwood Estate immediately to the north of the regeneration site from Sunday 25th to Tuesday 27th July 2010.

Scotney Hall exhibition

5.7 A further detailed exhibition was held on Friday 1st and Saturday 2nd October 2010 at Scotney Hall on the Winslade Estate immediately to the south of the regeneration area in order to engage with those were not able to attend either People’s Day or the Lewington Centre exhibition because they were away during the summer.

Access

5.8 Following consultation with Wheelpower – a disability sports charity – Renewal established an Access Forum to ensure that the development is accessible to all. Renewal approached the National Association of
Disabled Supporters and the London Access Forum to help establish this group that informs the detailed design of the scheme across all uses.

**Young People**

5.9 Renewal identified the importance of speaking with as many young people as possible given the number of young people in the New Bermondsey area is very high (27.4% of the local population are aged between 15-25 compared with 11.5% across London).

5.10 In partnership with the Deptford X visual arts festival, Renewal commissioned the ‘A Load of Rubbish’ project. The project enabled Turner Prize nominated artist Mark Titchner to run workshops with Deptford Green students to create three pieces of artwork which were displayed on the three refuse trucks which serve North Lewisham.

5.11 Renewal presented to the Council’s Young Mayor and Cabinet and their feedback had a direct impact on the scheme – for example the type of sports facilities included (The Young Mayor and Cabinet’s creative response to the proposals led to the inclusion of a climbing wall in the proposals and led to the consideration of more unusual sports, such as a diving centre. Following initial presentation to the group, Renewal kept in close contact with them, invited them to events and kept them updated with the plans for the Emerging Scheme as they developed.

5.12 Renewal presented to the Ministry of Youth group who are based immediately to the south of the New Bermondsey area on the Winslade Estate and they have worked closely with the Ministry of Youth on the proposals for an enhanced community park at Bridgehouse Meadows.

**Faith Leaders and Groups**

5.13 Renewal spoke to Faith Leaders and Groups through surveys, and one to one meetings with Faith Leaders, the Faith Officer at the Council and Dr Chris Hewson from the University of Manchester who is conducting research into multi-faith spaces. This enabled Renewal to understand the difficulties Faith Groups can face with regards to finding suitable property, and to more effectively engage with these different groups. A key finding from the consultation exercise was that there is a huge demand for long term, purpose built facilities for faith organisations.

5.14 Overall Renewal spoke to over 100 Faith & Community organisations and appointed Michael Wakelin, former Head of Religion and Diversity at the BBC and current Director of Coexist Programmes at Cambridge University, to assist with finding suitable occupiers for phase 1 of the scheme. Mr Wakelin assisted Renewal with shortlisting 6 potential Faith occupiers, developing their proposals with them, understanding their organisations, and commercially testing their requirements. From 6 organisations we decided to work with Hillsong, a moderate growing Pentecostal Church. Hillsong are operating from interim facilities on site at Stockholm Road whilst phase 1 is being developed.

**Millwall Football Club**

5.15 Renewal engaged with Millwall Football Club fans, staff and management through fans forums, meetings at the two public exhibitions, advertisements in match day programmes and an interview on the Lions Live (Millwall fans) radio show on 18th November 2010. Overall Renewal spoke directly to 975 Millwall fans.

5.16 Millwall Football Club submitted four letters setting out detailed comments in response to the application as originally submitted (22 March 2011 and 12 April 2011), the application as revised in July 2011 (18 August 2011) and the application as revised in September 2011 (30 September 2011).


Deptford X

5.17 Renewal was the lead sponsor for Deptford X 2010 and through this partnership were linked with a well-established local event which seeks to put a spotlight on the talent and potential of the area. Renewal met the Deptford X board in July 2010.

5.18 As well as being the lead sponsor for the festival Renewal also supported three projects:

- Deptford Green School, ‘A Load of Rubbish’ project;
- Deptford X award; and
- Peter Anderson exhibition.

Bridgehouse Meadow workshop

5.19 A CABE Spaceshaper workshop was held with local residents and stakeholders in October 2010 to investigate the current use and potential of the space at Bridgehouse Meadows which will inform the design team’s approach to creating a revitalised community park.

5.20 Following submission of the outline planning application, consultation by the Council as local planning authority comprised press and site notices and consultation letters to over 5,400 neighbouring properties.

5.21 A total of 21 written comments were received in response to the application as originally submitted (February 2011); 20 raising objections to the proposals and 1 offering unqualified support.

Application as revised in July 2011

5.22 A briefing note summarising the key aspects of the proposals were presented to the Assembly at its meeting on 8 June 2011.

5.23 In response to the July 2011 revisions, letters were hand delivered to all businesses within the application boundary and all residents within the wider consultation area. Letters dated 11/07/2011 gave people at least 28 days (up to 8 August 2011) to comment on the proposals as revised.

5.24 Following the submission of revisions and re-consultation on the original application in July 2011, 7 letters were received from local residents, businesses and interested parties. Due to the level of response, in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement a local meeting was held on 2 August 2011. All those who had made representations in response to the first consultation exercise were invited to the meeting, as were ward Councillors.

5.25 The outline application and responses to consultation were reported to the Council’s Strategic Planning Committee on 13 October 2011.

Application as revised in September 2011

5.26 In response to the September 2011 revisions, letters were sent to all the individuals and organisations that had commented on the original application or the application as revised in July 2011, giving 21 days to comment. Later in September 2011, the applicant submitted two technical notes relating to the use of the proposed pedestrian/cycle route to South Bermondsey station and the use of a New Bermondsey station on match days. Millwall FC was consulted on these notes and given 21 days to comment.
Local Residents and Businesses

5.27 5,400 letters were hand-delivered to properties within an area up to approximately 400 metres of the site. Letters dated 11 February 2011 were delivered on or before that date, and gave people at least 30 days (up to 14 March 2011) to comment on the proposals.

5.28 Due to capacity issues and the planned disruption to the Council’s website between 15 February 2011 and 21 February 2011 (to facilitate a move of its data centre), copies of all original application documents were published on a dedicated page of the applicant’s website. The revised application documents submitted in July and September 2011 were published on the Council’s website in the normal way.

Post Outline Consent granted, March 2012

5.29 Since Outline Consent was granted Renewal has responded to comments made by the Football Club to the local press with statements which have been published in full on our website (Lewisham Council Freehold Sale, 12th February 2014)

Section 73 Application, September 2013

5.30 Details of the Section 73 application were uploaded to surreycanal.com and all tenants on the site have been kept informed of the scheme progress. On 22nd May 2013 the Millwall Community Scheme were updated on the scheme and present at that meeting was the Chief Executive of Millwall FC.

5.31 Renewal consulted widely with Sport England and the various National Governing Bodies of sport who all supported the proposals for condensing the sports facilities from 4 buildings into 1.

Online

5.32 The project website was launched to coincide with the public launch at Lewisham People’s Day in July 2010. Since Outline Consent was granted in March 2012 Renewal have re-launched the New Bermondsey website (www.surreycanal.com) which includes statements from Renewal and all planning application documents (http://www.surreycanal.com/planning) submitted to the Council. A stand-alone website has been developed for the Surrey Canal Sports Foundation (www.surreycanalsportsfoundation.org.uk) and established a Twitter account for the sports foundation (@SCSportsFoundation). A new scheme website: www.newbermondsey.com was launched in February 2015, with all traffic from www.surreycanal.com directing to www.newbermondsey.com.

New Bermondsey

5.33 In February 2015 the scheme was re-launched as New Bermondsey to coincide with the Mayor of London’s announcement that the scheme has been designated as a Housing Zone. 1,500 Newsletters were delivered to businesses on the site, in the local area and local residents. The newsletter was also made available on the website.
Since the granting of Outline Planning consent Renewal has received weekly enquiries from local residents and businesses. Renewal responds to every enquiry within 48 hours and a copy of all correspondence has been kept.

**Consultation and Protected Characteristics**

The Statement of Community Engagement supporting the Planning Application highlights the diversity of the area, for example in terms of ethnicity and religion, the high proportion of young people and range of socio-economic deprivation prevalent in the area.

This socio-economic baseline, as well as feedback from initial discussions with the Council, helped Renewal to focus on engaging with particular groups (for example faith groups and young people) to ensure that the development could take into account the views and concerns of identified groups sharing protected characteristics in the area.
6 LEGISLATION, GUIDANCE AND POLICY

Legislation

6.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires public bodies to be pro-active in achieving equality.

6.2 As part of the planning process, and as required by the Equality Act 2010, a Local Authority is required to take due regard to advance the equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant “protected characteristic” and those who do not; and the need to foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not. The practical effect is that public bodies will consider how their policies, programmes and service delivery will affect people with the protected characteristics, including through the determination of planning applications and programme of development in their areas.

6.3 The Equality Act 2010 sets out a list of protected characteristics which prioritise particular characteristics aiming to reduce socioeconomic inequalities, these include:

- Age;
- Disability;
- Gender reassignment;
- Marriage and civil partnership;
- Pregnancy and maternity;
- Race;
- Religion or belief;
- Sex; and
- Sexual orientation.

6.4 The main objective of Equality Impact Assessment has been to ensure public policies and programmes are implemented fairly, in particular with regard to their impact on the groups identified above.

6.5 In the context of large, mixed use development with a series of buildings and uses, open spaces and infrastructure, many of the impacts are inherently more difficult to define or quantify. The physical characteristics of the buildings would in most cases be of less direct or predictable consequence for equalities. Equalities impacts would depend more on the future interaction of broader policy and social factors in the wider community with the actions of future occupiers, owners and users of the buildings.

Regional and Local Policy

London

6.6 The London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for London (consolidated with alterations since 2011) (March 2015) includes strategic policies to encourage equal life chances for all, in recognition of social inequalities that exist within the city. A number of policies outline the approach to protection of disadvantaged groups, including:
Policy 3.1 (Ensuring equal life chances for all), which outlines that:

A - Addressing the barriers to meeting the needs of particular groups and communities is key to tackling the huge issue of inequality across London; and

B - Development proposals should protect and enhance facilities and services that meet the needs of particular groups and communities. Proposals involving loss of these facilities without adequate justification or provision for replacement should be resisted;

Policy 3.2 (Improving health and addressing health inequalities), which outlines that development decisions must have due regard to health inequalities that prevail especially in London’s most deprived areas and promote a strong and diverse economy providing opportunities for all;

Policy 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments), which highlights the importance of taking particular account of the needs of children and older people;

Policy 3.7 (Large residential developments), which highlights the need to plan these areas with the engagement of local communities and stakeholders.

The London Plan includes a number of other policies covering housing tenure and type (Policies 3.8-3.15); and public services, community facilities and accessibility (Policies 3.16-3.19) that relate to taking account of equalities impacts in development decisions.

As part of the Mayor’s Equality Framework (2014) “Equal Life Chances for All”, The Greater London Authority (GLA) has prioritised particular sections of the population as equality target groups, including women; black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) people; young people and children; older people; disabled people; lesbians; gay men; trans people and people from different faith groups. The Strategy emphasizes the importance of addressing the needs of disadvantaged and vulnerable people and communities, and of supporting development of a diverse economy. It emphasises the importance of increasing employment within hard-to-reach groups, and reducing employment income inequalities.

London Borough of Lewisham

As outlined by the Equality Act 2010, when making decisions the Council is required to have ‘due regard’ to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

The Council adopted its LDF Core Strategy in 2011, which included an Equalities Impact Assessment to identify what effect, or likely effect, will follow from the implementation of the Core Strategy for different groups within the community.

New Bermondsey is highlighted by the Council as an area for major regeneration, to create new jobs, homes and community facilities, new sporting facilities, an improved setting for Millwall Football Club Stadium, new linkages and new publicly accessible open spaces in a safe and welcoming environment.
A key tenet of the Core Strategy is to contribute to improving health and well-being and reduce health inequalities across Lewisham by providing decent quality housing, access to employment and training, and encourage healthy lifestyles and opportunities for increasing physical activity.

Through Core Strategy Objective 11 (Community well-being), New Cross ward is identified as an area in particular need of addressing the prevailing deprivation and health inequalities, in order to promote social inclusion and strengthen quality of life for new and existing residents. Additionally, Spatial Policy 2 identifies that in this area the Council will, working with its partners, will secure the necessary infrastructure to support the planned levels of growth and will maximise the physical, social and environmental regeneration opportunities new development will bring for the benefit of existing and future residents, to address deprivation issues, particularly health inequalities, to improve well-being.

The LDF Core Strategy recognises that the key drivers for change in the area will be through:

- The provision of new housing in a range of sizes and tenures, including accessible and lifetime homes, to tackle accessibility and affordability issues;
- Growth of the local economy to address current problems of unemployment and economic activity and low levels of investment; and
- Building a sustainable community, addressing the current low skills base and high levels of multiple deprivation and health inequalities.

The Council’s aspirations for the north of the borough, including New Cross, include the desire to “address deprivation issues in order to improve education standards, general health and well-being, and local employment and training, through improvements to the physical and economic environment” (LDF Core Strategy).

Lewisham’s Comprehensive Equalities Scheme ‘Equality for All’ (2012-2016) sets out the Council’s vision for reducing inequality and ensuring all citizens have appropriate access to and choice of high quality services. The Council’s commitment goes beyond the requirements of legislation and sets out aspiration to take all reasonable steps to ensure that every citizen is able to do the best for themselves and for others.

The scheme sets out a number of key objectives for the Council and its partners, including the following which have been identified as key characteristics for the New Bermondsey development:

- To tackle victimisation, discrimination and harassment;
- Improve access to services; and
- Increase participation and engagement.

The Council’s approach to quality for all relates to measureable outcomes that all development in the borough should aspire to help - such as higher standards of educational achievement for children & young people, an improved quality of life for those living with long-term conditions, strong cohesive communities and a narrowing of the gap in outcomes between the most affluent and the most deprived.

As such, development should recognize that not everybody starts from the same place, but this should not be a barrier to life chances and intervention in the built environment should promote fairness for all.

Lewisham’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2013) “Health and Well-being for all by 2023” provides an analysis of the needs of residents to help communities and organisations improve local health and well-being to tackle health inequalities.
6.21 The Strategy notes that Lewisham faces some significant health and well-being challenges, including high rates of smoking and high teenage conception rates, and is in the lowest 20% of areas nationally for deprivation, life expectancy, and premature deaths from cancer and cardiovascular disease, highlighting that as Lewisham’s population grows in size and diversity, its needs will change and services and support will need to adapt in order to minimise potential inequalities.

6.22 Significant health inequalities can be found between wards within the borough, highlighting that New Cross and Evelyn wards frequently appear at the top of the list for deprivation, mortality rates and lowest life expectancy. In addition to geographic inequalities, there are also population groups that experience poorer outcomes than others.

6.23 Lewisham’s **Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2020 (2008)** is based on key themes of reducing inequality and ensuring that all residents have equal and appropriate access to high quality local services. The Strategy promotes the building of sustainable communities that are safer, with a high degree of community involvement, with high quality housing and opportunities for maintaining health and well-being.
7 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

7.1 This section of the report presents evidence on the existing population living and working in the local area (New Cross ward), which includes the New Bermondsey Site. The primary focus of this baseline assessment is to identify the local population and directly affected residents, businesses, employees and groups in relation to protected characteristics as described by the Equality Act 2010 and guidance from the Greater London Authority.

A Brief History and Current Status

7.2 New Bermondsey has a diverse history, with constant shifts in character and land use. The area was once on the periphery of London, but now forms a significant part of inner London’s network of places. Having previously been in primarily residential use, the site became a public park in 1972, and then the home of Millwall Football Club when the New Den Stadium was opened in 1993 alongside light industrial and commercial floorspace.

7.3 In recent times, the area has been in general decline in terms of economic and population trends and physical infrastructure, with high unemployment, deprivation and poor health prevailing.

7.4 New Bermondsey currently includes several industrial / business estates, alongside the Millwall Football Club Stadium, and the Lions Centre. A number of the buildings on-site are small business / low-bay and small industrial units in varying degrees of operation and vacancy. The local area has lacked investment in streetscape, and as is of poor aesthetic quality (Figure 1).

7.5 The vision for New Bermondsey is based on regenerating an old and decaying industrial area, creating a new sustainable community that is a destination in its own right. New Bermondsey aims to develop a unique identity, building on existing strengths which include its young, creative, multicultural community, its location and its established sporting heritage. Improvements to the physical environment will be coupled with providing new jobs and homes and community facilities, creating vibrant publicly accessible open spaces, and address issues of severance and inaccessibility.
Figure 1 – Current Physical Environment at and around New Bermondsey
Deprivation

Overall Deprivation

7.6 New Bermondsey (in New Cross Ward, Lewisham), is one of the most deprived areas in London and the UK, with deprivation particularly acute in terms of crime, employment, health, housing, income and living environment (Figure 2):

Figure 2 – Indices of Multiple Deprivation (DCLG, 2015)

7.7 The area shares similar characteristics with a number of London’s most deprived areas, reflected in the demographic and economic profile of the local community, with a high proportion of people aged under 16, a large Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) population, and a lower proportion of residents with higher educational attainment.

Income and Employment Deprivation

7.8 The purpose of these domains is to capture the proportions of the population experiencing income deprivation in an area, and involuntary exclusion of the working age population from work. Areas in the immediate vicinity of the New Bermondsey site are significantly deprived as indicated below. A more detailed degree of individual indictors of unemployment and worklessness is presented later in this document.

Crime Deprivation

7.9 This domain measures the rate of recorded crime for four major crime themes – burglary, theft, criminal damage and violence – representing the occurrence of personal and material victimisation at a local (lower-
level super output area) level. The IMD crime domain is based on the frequency of incidences of four types of crime: burglary, theft, criminal damage and violent crime, indicating that these are prominent issues in this area.

Housing Deprivation

7.10 The housing domain measures barriers to housing and key local services. Indicators used in this domain are divided into two categories; geographical barriers and wider barriers. Geographical barriers measure road distance to GPs, supermarkets or convenience stores, primary schools and post offices. Wider barriers include household overcrowding, barriers to social housing and affordability. As indicated in Figure 3, much of north Lewisham is severely deprived in terms of these indicators, within the highest 10% of deprived areas nationally.

*Figure 3 – Individual Domains of Deprivation - Income, Employment, Housing and Crime (DCLG, 2015)*

Education Deprivation

7.11 The purpose of this domain is to capture the extent of deprivation in education, skills and training in a local area. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: one relating to lack of attainment among children and young people and one relating to lack of qualifications in terms of skills. These two sub-domains are designed to reflect the “flow” and “stock” of educational disadvantage within an area respectively. That is, the children/young people sub-domain measures the deprivation in attaining the qualifications, while the skills sub-domain measures the deprivation in the resident working area adult population.
Health Deprivation

7.12 This Domain shows areas with higher rates of people who die prematurely or whose life has been impaired by poor health or who are disabled. Analysis of this data shows that New Cross is an area that is within the top 20% most deprived in the country in terms of health.

Living Environment Deprivation

7.13 The ‘living environment’ domain comprises two sub-domains: the ‘indoors’ living environment which measures the quality of housing and the ‘outdoors’ living environment which contains two measures about air quality and road traffic accidents. London overall is largely within the top 20% or 10% in the country due to its high density urban characteristics.

2011 Census – Dimensions of Deprivation

7.14 The dimensions of deprivation used to classify households in the 2011 Census are indicators based on the four selected household characteristics. A household is deprived in a dimension if they meet one or more of the following conditions:

- **Employment**: any member of a household not a full-time student is either unemployed or long-term sick,
- **Education**: no person in the household has at least level 2 education (see highest level of qualification), and no person aged 16-18 is a fulltime student,
- **Health and disability**: any person in the household has general health ‘bad or very bad’ or has a long term health problem, and
- **Housing**: Household’s accommodation is ether overcrowded, with an occupancy rating -1 or less, or is in a shared dwelling, or has no central heating.

7.15 A household is classified as being deprived in none, or one to four of these dimensions in any combination. New Cross has a higher proportion of households experiencing 1 or more dimension of deprivation (70%, compared to 62% in London:

**Figure 4 – Dimensions of Deprivation (Census, 2011)**
7.16 New Cross has a high proportion of children, with 20% of the population aged 0-16. This is a similar proportion to Lewisham and London, although is weighted towards younger children, with 6.5% aged under 4, compared to 6% in London.

7.17 According to 2011 Census data, at 56% of the population, New Cross ward has a higher proportion of younger working age people (aged 16-44) than Lewisham (49%) and London (48%), reflecting a higher overall proportion of residents of working age (aged 16-64).

7.18 The population of New Cross ward has a younger profile than Lewisham and London, and also has a lower proportion of people of retirement age (65+), at 6% compared to 9% in Lewisham and 11% in London (Census, 2011). The following charts compare New Cross, Lewisham, London and England and Wales in terms of the age structure by sex:

*Figure 5 – Age Profile by Sex (Census, 2011)*
Ethnic Groups

7.19 The New Cross ward shows a high level of ethnic diversity, with Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups accounting for 60% of residents, compared to 46% in Lewisham and 40% in London (Census, 2011).

7.20 This BAME population at the local scale is predominantly made up of a large proportion of Black African and Black Caribbean residents, accounting for 37% of all BAME residents and 37% of all residents. Mixed-race people account for a similar proportion of residents in New Cross (7%) as Lewisham (7%) and London (5%), while the local and borough-level has a lower proportion of Asian residents compared to London (13% and 9% respectively, compared to 18%):

*Figure 6 – Ethnic Group (Census, 2011)*

7.21 There is a significant variation of ethnic profile by age group locally, with younger groups (0-15 years especially) in New Cross showing a great degree of ethnic diversity compared to older groups, as highlighted in the following chart:
7.22 A Report by NHS Lewisham\textsuperscript{41} on local needs of ethnic groups in North Lewisham highlights the specific cultural identities prevalent in the local area, for example there is a concentration of 3,500-4,000 Vietnamese residents in North Lewisham, many of whom live in the Deptford and New Cross areas. The PCT highlights that the Vietnamese population experience many of the features of a newly settled community, with many lacking fluent English, with high levels of unemployment, low levels of educational achievement and tend not to access mainstream services.

Marriage and Civil Partnership

7.23 Marriage and Civil Partnership is identified as a key equality indicator by the Equality Act 2010 with respect to eliminating discrimination in the context of employment. In New Cross, around 57% of residents aged 16+ are identified as ‘single – never married or never registered in a same-sex civil partnership’, compared to 50% in Lewisham and 4% in London, perhaps reflecting the younger age profile locally. Around 27% of people are ‘married’ in New Cross, compared to 33% in Lewisham and 40% in London. The proportion of ‘divorced’ residents locally – around 8% - is broadly in-line with other scales. The proportion of residents in New Cross in same-sex civil partnerships (form the 2011 Census) is 0.6% - slightly higher than in Lewisham (0.5%) and London (0.4%):
There is currently one residential unit within the site, Bridge House, owned by an external investor and currently in private rented use as a House of Multiple Occupation. The Developer and the owner of Bridge House have agreed Heads of Terms for the purchase of Bridge House. Exchange and completion, with vacant possession, is imminent, therefore it is very unlikely that the CPO will be required for Bridge House.

New Cross has a far lower proportion of housing stock in ‘owned’ tenures (i.e. outright or with a mortgage) compared to Lewisham, London and England and Wales. The private rented sector dominates locally, covering around a third of total stock, compared to a quarter in Lewisham and London. Additionally, there is a high concentration of social rented homes (40% in New Cross, compared to 31% in Lewisham and 24% in London) – with a far higher than average proportion of these rented from the Council rather than other sources (e.g. Registered Social Landlords):
7.26 The general residential character of the area is higher density than average for London, but in-line with central London areas, with 75% of the housing stock in New Cross ward comprised of flats, compared to 57% in Lewisham and 54% in London. Around two thirds of this stock is in purpose-built blocks rather than house conversions, a higher proportion than at wider scales:

*Table 1 – Accommodation Type (Census, 2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Detached</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Terraced (including end-terrace)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: Purpose-built block of flats or tenement</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: Part of a converted or shared house</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: In a commercial building</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Household Composition**

7.27 The composition of households in North Lewisham reflects the age profile of the area, with a lower proportion of single pension-age households (5.8% compared to 9.6% in London), although has a higher proportion of single-person households overall at 37% compared to 32% for London. Additionally, in New Cross there is a higher proportion of households with dependent children and lone parent households, and a lower proportion of married or same-sex civil partnership households:

*Table 2 – Household Composition (Census, 2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person household</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person household: Aged 65 and over</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person household: Other</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family household</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: All aged 65 and over</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Married or same-sex civil partnership couple</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Married or same-sex civil partnership couple: No children</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Married or same-sex civil partnership couple: Dependent children</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Married or same-sex civil partnership couple: All children non-dependent</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Cohabiting couple</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Cohabiting couple: No children</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Cohabiting couple: Dependent children</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Cohabiting couple: All children non-dependent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Lone parent</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Lone parent: Dependent children</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One family only: Lone parent: All children non-dependent</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household types</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household types: With dependent children</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other household types: All full-time students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overcrowding

7.28 “Occupancy rating”, as defined by the ONS for 2011 Census, provides a measure of whether a household’s accommodation is overcrowded or under-occupied, based on the number of people per bedroom. The ages of the household members and their relationships to each other are used to derive the number of rooms/bedrooms they require, based on a standard formula. The number of rooms/bedrooms required is subtracted from the number of rooms/bedrooms in the household’s accommodation to obtain the occupancy rating. An occupancy rating of -1 implies that a household has one fewer room/bedroom than required, whereas +1 implies that they have one more room/bedroom than the standard requirement.

7.29 In Lewisham, 12% of households have an occupancy rating of -1 or less (i.e. are overcrowded). This rate is higher in New Cross, at 18% of households. Both are higher than the London average of 11% and national average of 5% (Census, 2011).

7.30 Data from the 2011 Census provides a breakdown by ethnicity and tenure of households, identifying a disparity – in Lewisham, compared to an average 12% of households being overcrowded, households with a white Household Reference Person (HRP) are less likely to be overcrowded (8%), with mixed, Asian and black HRP households showing higher rates of overcrowding (between 15% and 21%):

Figure 10 – Occupancy Rating by Ethnicity of Household Reference Person (Census, 2011)
7.31 Households in social rented and private rented tenures are more likely to be over-crowded. In New Cross, around 16% of social rented households, and 19% of private rented households have an occupancy rating of -1 or less, with similarly high proportions in London:

*Figure 11 – Occupancy Rating by Accommodation Tenure (Census, 2011)*

7.32 Housing affordability is measured in a number of meaningful ways, one of which is to compare an area’s lower quartile earnings and lower quartile house prices as a ratio, giving an indication of the potential for lower earners to enter the housing market. In Lewisham, as across London, this ratio has been steadily increasing from 2004, with a slight dip during the recession in 2009 followed by a peak at 10.29 in 2012. The current ratio of lower quartile earnings to lower quartile house price in Lewisham is 8.41, compared to a national average of 6.45, indicating that affordability and access to housing is a problem:

*Figure 12 – Ratio of Lower Quartile House Price to Lower Quartile Earnings (DCLG Live Tables, 2013)*
Qualification Attainment and Skills

Qualification Attainment

According to 2011 Census data, the qualification attainment level of all residents aged 16+ in New Cross is very similar to Lewisham and London levels – approximately 18% at all scales have no qualifications, and 1-2% have apprenticeships. There is a slightly lower proportion of residents with higher (degree-level) qualifications in New Cross (35% compared to 38% in Lewisham and London), and a higher proportion of ‘other’ qualifications (12% compared to 8% in Lewisham and 10% in London):

Figure 13 – Highest Level of Qualification (Census, 2011)

The following table gives a full breakdown of the type of qualifications gained by residents (in many cases, a resident has gained more than one qualification):

Table 2 – Qualification Gained (Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 O levels/CSE/GCSEs (any grades), Entry Level, Foundation Diploma</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 1, Foundation GNVQ, Basic Skills</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+ O level (Passes)/CSEs (Grade 1)/GCSEs (Grades A*-C), School Certificate, 1 A level/2-3 AS levels/VCEs, Higher Diploma, Welsh Baccalaureate Intermediate Diploma</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 2, Intermediate GNVQ, City and Guilds Craft, BTEC First/General Diploma, RSA Diploma</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ A levels/VCEs, 4+ AS levels, Higher School Certificate, Progression/Advanced Diploma, Welsh Baccalaureate Advanced Diploma</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NVQ Level 3, Advanced GNVQ, City and Guilds Advanced Craft, ONC, OND, BTEC National, RSA Advanced Diploma
Degree (for example BA, BSc), Higher degree (for example MA, PhD, PGCE)
NVQ Level 4-5, HNC, HND, RSA Higher Diploma, BTEC Higher Level
Professional qualifications (for example teaching, nursing, accountancy)
Other vocational/work-related qualifications
Foreign qualifications

7.35 There is a key difference when looking at the qualification attainment of different age groups, ethnic groups and sex. In New Cross. In terms of age group, only 8% of the 16-24 and 25-34 age group have no qualifications, with the proportion of residents aged 25-34 showing a significant proportion (over half) educated to degree-level or higher. Additionally, older age groups have a much higher propensity to have lower qualification attainment (or without qualification):

*Figure 14 – Highest Level of Qualification by Age Group (Census, 2011)*
Occupational Skill Level

7.36 The population of New Cross ward has a slightly higher proportion of residents in employment in lower-skilled occupations (process and plant, and elementary roles), at 21% compared to 14% across Lewisham and London. There is also a lower proportion employed in generally higher-skilled roles (management, professional and technical) at 39% compared to 49% in Lewisham and 50% in London:

Figure 15 – Occupational Skill Level (Standard Occupational Classification) of Residents (Census, 2011)

Benefit Claimants

7.37 There are currently around 1,700 people claiming benefits in New Cross ward – around 14% of all working age residents. The main claimant group is Employment Support Allowance and incapacity benefit (around 860 people, or 6.8%, followed by job-seekers allowance (covered below), lone parents (215), carers and disabled people (220). There is a slightly higher proportion of women claiming all benefits (15.1% of all women are benefit claimants, compared to 12.2% of men, and a disparity in terms of age group, with 7.3% of people aged 25 to 49).

Workforce and Business Structure

Industrial Representation - Site

7.38 The site is mainly occupied by light industrial floorspace, including 19 units within the Excelsior Works industrial estate which also contains live/work space. The Enterprise Industrial Estate is formed of 42 units including a mix of B class uses, two church facilities and a café. The land to the south west of Surrey Canal Road comprises run down warehouse buildings and timber processing facility. The existing Orion Industrial Estate is formed of approximately 25 units. Units 5-10 are being demolished as part of works being undertaken by Transport for London, and the remaining units are operating under a mix of B class uses. The
Lions Centre comprises 4,120 sqm of floorspace and the Stadium currently provides 11,900 sqm of floorspace.

7.39 Three existing buildings are intended to be retained within the site – Guild House (three-storey warehouse), the New Den (stadium) and Rollins House (live/work accommodation).

*Industrial Representation – Local Area*

7.40 According to the most recent data from the Business Register and Employment Survey (2014), there are approximately 5,900 jobs in the New Cross ward, comprising around 10% of all jobs in Lewisham. The sectors represented in the ward are a mix of manufacturing, construction, utility, wholesale/retail and motor trades and repairs (20% of jobs), transport and storage (together accounting for 49% of jobs) and public sector employment (education, health and public administration account for 26% of jobs).

7.41 The general character is therefore of light industry, with supporting services including food service and retail. In terms of the concentration of sectors, given by ‘locational quotients’, there is an over-representation and dependence on public sector jobs (LQ value of 1.4 to 1.7) compared to London average, and a significant over-representation of manufacturing (LQ of 2.5), utilities (4.5) and transportation and storage (3.8).

7.42 A report on industrial unit availability in the local area was completed in 2010 as part of the outline planning application for New Bermondsey. This shows the availability of B1, B2 and B8 accommodation within the SE16, SE15, SE14 and SE8 postcodes adjoining the site, and shows that at the date of this report the availability of space within these areas stood at 35,974 sqm. The existing B1, B2, B8 area on the New Bermondsey Site equates to 22,155 sqm which includes Guild House on Rollins Street that will be retained within the masterplan, and in addition the B1 uses within the Site will re-provide 10,000-15,000sqm.

*Business Number and Size by Sector*

7.43 Data for the number of local business units from the Inter Departmental Business Register (2013) identifies the size and industry (2007 Standard Industrial Classification) of workplaces. This data highlights that 83% of local units in New Cross are ‘micro-businesses’ i.e. employ 0-9 people. The proportion is much higher across Lewisham at 88%, compared to 85% in London. A significant proportion of micro businesses in Lewisham are in information and communication or professional, scientific and technical industries (34%). Additionally, there are over 1,000 micro workplaces in ‘digital media’ activities.

7.44 VAT registrations in Lewisham have grown significantly year-on-year, above the London-wide rate since the mid-1990s, with a peak in 2007 at 72% higher than new registrations in 1994 (when the dataset starts):
Employment and Economic Activity

**Economic Activity**

7.45 Economic activity in New Cross stands at around 70% of all residents, the same rate as for Lewisham and higher than the average for London (67%). The ‘employment rate’ – i.e. economically active residents who are not in work and are not full-time students is however higher locally at 7.4%, compared to 5.8% in Lewisham and 4.9% in London.

7.46 Both the levels of economic activity and employment rates differ for different age groups, sex and ethnic groups at the local and wider scales. In New Cross, unemployment is highest among Black/African/Caribbean/Black British and mixed/multiple ethnic groups, although the sample size is much smaller.

**Figure 16 – % Increase in VAT Registrations compared to Base Year 1994 in Lewisham and London (ONS, 2013)**

**Figure 17 – Economic Activity and Unemployment by Ethnic Group (Census, 2011)**
There is also a disparity in terms of employment and economic activity by age in New Cross. Overall economic activity rate in the ward is 70%, with unemployment at 7.4%. In the 16-24 age group, economic activity is far lower at 54%, although this is a factor of high proportion of full-time students in this age group. Notably, even discounting economically active students, the unemployment rate in this age group is lower than the average for all ages at 6.2%. Similarly, economic activity is lower at 48% for over-50s, but a significant proportion of the population in this age group is retired:

Table 3 – Components of Economic Activity and Inactivity (Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically Active</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: In employment</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: In employment: Employee</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: In employment: Self-employed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: In employment: Full-time students</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: Unemployed: Total</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: Unemployed: Unemployed (excl. full-time students)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically active: Unemployed: Full-time students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Inactive</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive: Retired</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive: Student (including full-time students)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive: Looking after home or family</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive: Long-term sick or disabled</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive: Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job-Seekers Allowance Claimants

The most recent data available for identifying unemployed residents registered as looking for work and claiming Job-Seekers Allowance (JSA) indicates that in April 2015, overall JSA claimant rate in New Cross was 3.4% of the total working age population (402 people), compared to 2.8% in Lewisham (5,560 people) and 2.1% in London (118,038 people)46.

---

46 JSA Claimant Count (March 2015) – Department of Work and Pensions
There are a number of factors to consider in terms of JSA claimant count – including the length of time people have been claiming, the type of skills people have and therefore occupations they are seeking, their sex, age and ethnicity.

JSA Claimants – Ethnicity, Age, Sex and Duration

Around 54% of JSA claimants in New Cross are men, compared to 60% in Lewisham and London.

In both London and Lewisham, around a third of JSA claimants are registered as ‘ethnic minorities’. The breakdown within this group differs significantly between Lewisham and London, with ‘Black or Black British’ people representing 29% of all JSA claimants in Lewisham compared to 20% in London, and ‘Asian or Asian British’ people representing 8% of all claimants in London compared to 1% in Lewisham.

The following table compares the proportion of claimants by age, sex and duration, highlighting that Lewisham has a slightly higher proportion of longer-term claimants (18 months+) across men and women aged 25+, but due to a comparatively low proportion of younger claimants, has a broadly representative proportion of long-term claimants overall.

**Table 4 – JSA Claimants by Age, Sex and Duration (DWP, October 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th></th>
<th>London</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 18-24</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 18-24, claiming for over 6 months</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 18-24, claiming for under 6 months</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 19 and under</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 24 and under</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 24 and under, claiming for over 12 months</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 24 and under, claiming for over 6 months</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 25 and over, claiming for over 1 year</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 25 and over, claiming for over 18 months</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 25 and over, claiming for over 2 years</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 50 and over, claiming for over 6 months</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiming for over 12 months</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiming for over 6 months</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The profile of sought occupation of JSA claimants gives an idea of the skills base and employment requirements of currently unemployed residents in an area. Compared to the London average, there is a higher proportion of residents claiming JSA seeking employment in lower skilled sectors (process and elementary roles), and a slightly lower proportion in mid-level (e.g. administrative, sales, personal service and skilled trades) and higher skilled sectors (professional, technical and management roles):

*Figure 18 – JSA Claimants by Sought Occupation i.e. Occupational Skill Level (DWP, October 2015)*

The sought occupation of JSA claimants also differs between sexes. The following chart identifies the sought occupational skill between male and female claimants in New Cross, Lewisham and London, highlighting that at all spatial scales there is a greater proportion of women seeking mid-level skilled work compared to men, and a lower proportion seeking lower skilled employment:
Earnings

Data from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2014) highlights that gross weekly earnings in Lewisham are slightly lower than the London average for full-time workers at £782.50 compared to £759.30. Part-time earnings are broadly in line with the London average. There is a disparity in both mean weekly gross earnings for men and women compared to the London average as highlighted in the following chart. The data does not distinguish between full-time and part-time working within sex, which leads to a lower mean where there is a higher proportion of part-time workers (reflected in lower average wages for women compared to men):

Figure 20 – Mean Gross Weekly Earnings by Sex and Full-Time/Part-Time (Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2014)
Long-term Health Problems and Disability

7.56 A long-term health problem or disability that limits a person's day-to-day activities, and has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months. This includes problems that are related to old age. People were asked to assess whether their daily activities were limited a lot or a little by such a health problem, or whether their daily activities were not limited at all.

7.57 In New Cross, 6% of all people identified in the 2011 Census that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot (1,012 people), compared to 7% in Lewisham and 9% in England and Wales.

Public Health Profile

7.58 NHS Lewisham and the Council’s Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) notes that the Borough currently faces some significant health and well-being challenges. These include high rates of smoking and high teenage conception rates. It further highlights that the North Lewisham area is in the lowest 20% of areas nationally for deprivation and life expectancy, and highest 20% for premature deaths from cancer and cardiovascular disease. This highlights that as Lewisham’s population grows in size and diversity, its needs will change and services and support will need to adapt in order to minimise potential inequalities.

7.59 A number of public datasets are available on a wide range of public health indicators. This baseline assessment uses Public Health England datasets for wards and Local Authorities, published in 2012 and including a number of comparable indicators of health inequality. The datasets include rates of disease, life expectancy, life-limiting conditions and mortality rates, hospital admissions and lifestyle factors.

7.60 For many indicators, New Cross shows a significant deviation from Lewisham and National incidence rates, indicating a high level of health inequality locally. Red cells in the following table highlight where indicators are ‘significantly worse than average’, yellow cells highlight where indicators are ‘not significantly different from average’ and green cells indicate where indicators are ‘significantly better than average’:

Table 5 – Summary of Public Health England Health Inequality Indicators (PHE, NHS, 2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>New Cross</th>
<th>Lewisham</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Births (%)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty (%)</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development at age 5 (%)</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health - bad or very bad (%)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health - very bad (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting long term illness or disability (%)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 1 hour or more unpaid care per week (%)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of 50 hours or more unpaid care per week (%)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older People in Deprivation (%)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese Children (Reception Year) (%)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese Children (Year 6) (%)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's and young people's admissions for injury (Crude rate/100,000 aged 0-17)</td>
<td>886.7</td>
<td>866.3</td>
<td>1223.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese adults (%)</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drinking adults (%)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy eating adults (%)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency hospital admissions for all causes (SAR)</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency hospital admissions for CHD (SAR)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency hospital admissions for stroke (SAR)</td>
<td>172.4</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency hospital admissions for Myocardial Infarction (heart attack) (SAR)</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency hospital admissions for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) (SAR)</td>
<td>202.5</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of all cancer (SRR)</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of breast cancer (SRR)</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of colorectal cancer (SRR)</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of lung cancer (SRR)</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of prostate cancer (SRR)</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital stays for self harm (SAR)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital stays for alcohol related harm (SAR)</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency hospital admissions for hip fracture in 65+ (SAR)</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective hospital admissions for hip replacement (SAR)</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective hospital admissions for knee replacement (SAR)</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth for males (years)</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth for females (years)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from all causes, all ages (SMR)</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from all causes, under 65 years (SMR)</td>
<td>130.6</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from all causes, under 75 years (SMR)</td>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Category</td>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>London SMR</td>
<td>England SMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from all cancer, all ages (SMR)</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from all cancer, under 75 years (SMR)</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from circulatory disease, all ages (SMR)</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from circulatory disease, under 75 years (SMR)</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from coronary heart disease, all ages (SMR)</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from coronary heart disease, under 75 years (SMR)</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from stroke, all ages (SMR)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths from respiratory diseases, all ages (SMR)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.61 Additionally, Lewisham has a teenage pregnancy rate of 69 per 1,000 female population aged 15-18, compared to a London average of 45 per 1,000, and also has a prevalence of low birth weight, which is a risk factor for infant mortality. In the New Cross ward, 9.7% of births were recorded to have a “low birth weight” (under 2,500g) compared to the Lewisham average of 7.8% and London average of 8%. At present, NHS Lewisham report that life expectancy at birth for New Cross is 4.5 years less than Lewisham average and 6 years below the national (England) average.

7.62 In summary:

- Life expectancy is significantly shorter for both men and women at birth in Lewisham than England, and even more acutely in New Cross;
- Standard mortality rates are significantly higher in New Cross and Lewisham, with rates in New Cross among the highest in England;
- Mortality rates across all coronary and respiratory diseases and cancer are significantly higher than average in New Cross and Lewisham;
- Hospital admissions are higher than average in New Cross and Lewisham, except for heart attacks and hip/knee replacement;
- Low birth weight, child obesity and child poverty are significantly higher than the national average in New Cross and Lewisham.

Faith / Religion

7.63 Within New Cross ward, 51% of residents record their religion or faith as ‘Christian’, the largest component, followed by ‘no religion’ at 25%, and ‘Muslim’ at 10%. The overall breakdown, as indicated by the following chart, is fairly similar to the Lewisham and London, although with a slightly higher proportion of Muslim residents compared to Lewisham and lower proportion compared to London. New Cross also has a lower proportion of Hindu, Jewish and Sikh residents compared to wider scales:
7.64 The Office of National Statistics (ONS) Integrated Household Survey data includes questions on sexual orientation, at a national and regional scale. Across the UK, 95% of adults identified themselves as heterosexual, 1% identified themselves as gay or lesbian and 0.5% identified themselves as bisexual. An additional 0.5% identified themselves as ‘other’. Although estimates are not available at a sub-regional scale, for London, 2.2% of respondents identified themselves as gay, lesbian or bisexual, higher than any other region.

7.65 The Government’s Treasury Department estimated that six per cent of the UK population was LGB in 2005 when conducting research into the impact of the Civil Partnerships Act.

7.66 The Greater London Authority (GLA), as part of the response to its General Equality Duty arising from the Equality Act (2010), highlights that “given London’s diversity and culture of tolerance, it is highly likely that the London figure is somewhat higher and estimates suggest that is in the region of 10%47”. The GLA has sought to build a detailed picture of sexual orientation in London, and subsequent needs of the Lesbian, Gay

47 GLA (2011) Assessment of the GLA’s impact on lesbian, gay and bisexual equality
and Bisexual (LGB) population. The evidence available on inequalities experienced by LGB communities is not comprehensive but highlights that, among other issues:

- A large proportion of LGB hate crimes are unreported;
- 80% of LGB respondents in a survey by Stonewall reported that they had been the victim of a hate crime\(^48\);
- Twice as many Black LGB people have been physically attacked than the overall lesbian and gay population; and
- Physical environment is a key concern in perceptions of safety within the LGB community;

Public Transport Accessibility

7.67 As part of the planning application for New Bermondsey, a Transport Assessment concluded that “while there are a number of existing pedestrian and cycling routes in and around the site currently, they are limited as a result of the severance of the railway and in relation to the poor perceived environment”.

7.68 The most recently available Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) data at the outline planning application highlighted that North Lewisham experiences a range of severance, with areas around New Cross, New Cross Gate and Deptford have relatively high accessibility ratings (4, 5 and 6a/b), compared to the area just to the north, including New Bermondsey, which has PTAL values of 1a/b and 2:

*Figure 22 - Public Transport Accessibility Levels (2011)*

Sport and Recreation Provision

7.69 Renewal commissioned Neil Allen Associates to undertake an assessment of the needs and demands for sport in North Lewisham as part of the New Bermondsey planning application in 2010. This study included an analysis of Sport England data on participation from the Active People Survey, and highlighted that:

- Sport England KPI 1 (participation i.e. % of the population taking part in 30 minutes of exercise three or more times a week) is 18.5% for Lewisham, below the national average of 21.6%
- Sport England KPI 2 (volunteering) is 3.6% for Lewisham, below the national average of 4.7%.
- Sport England KPI 3 (club membership) is 21.9% for Lewisham, below the national average of 24.1%
- Sport England KPI 4 (tuition) is 18.2% for Lewisham, above the national average of 17.5%
- Sport England KPI 5 (organised competition) is 12.4% for Lewisham, below the national average of 14.4%
- Sport England KPI 6 (satisfaction) is 56.9% for Lewisham, below the national average of 68.4% but a statistically significant increase on the previous 12 months

7.70 In summary, the report identified that there was a clear need across the borough to increase levels of regular participation and provide enhanced opportunities for volunteering, coaching and organised sport amongst the adult population in line with regional and national averages. Improved facility provision was also recognised as having a key role to play in supporting the delivery of improved performance and therefore driving the health agenda of the authority.

7.71 The key findings included an identified need for:

- An indoor hall sports venue for combination ball sports, including an events venue, with facilities for:
  - Basketball and netball - identified as a key draw due to the demographic profile of overall participation the sport matching the local population, and the lack of facilities and clubs in the local area;
  - Table tennis – due to the stated need in Lewisham for sports hall space (highlighted as a development sport by the Council) but a lack of dedicated venue for continuity to support a club base;
  - Gymnastics and boxing – in terms of recreational and higher level development; and

7.72 Lewisham’s Leisure and Open Space Study (2010) identified that there is a deficit in supply of indoor facilities including sports halls and swimming pools per 1,000 population, and identified a number of priority sports and development sports including football, swimming, cricket, basketball, gymnastics, athletics, netball, tennis, table tennis, cycling, hockey, judo and rugby.

7.73 Since the production of these reports, Sport England have undertaken an update to the previous participation and demographic profiles reported above, and have re-structured the ‘National Indicator’ approach in their most recent Active People Survey.
In Lewisham, adult (16+) participation in sport at least once per week is 34.7%, compared to a higher London average of 37.2%. There is a bigger disparity between Lewisham and London when younger people are included. Since the previous assessment outlined above:

- Sport England KPI 2 (volunteering) has decreased to 2.1% from 3.6% for Lewisham, below the national average of 4.9%.
- Sport England KPI 3 (club membership) has significantly decreased from 21.9% to 12.6% for Lewisham, below the national average of 21.1%
- Sport England KPI 4 (tuition) has increased from 18.2% to 21.2% for Lewisham, above the national average of 17.5%
- Sport England KPI 5 (organised competition) has decreased from 12.4% to 8.0% for Lewisham, below the national average which has decreased from 14.4% to 9.8%

Data has been produced to identify levels of participation in sport in Lewisham by demographic characteristic, including sex, ethnicity, disability and age. In terms of participation (rate of participation at least once per week):

- Men are more likely to participate in sport than women (37.8% compared to 32.1%); and
- Non-white residents participate in sport more than white residents (40.6% compared to 30.2%); and
- Data for disability and age are disclosive at the district level, but for London, there is a greater rate of participation in younger people (50.6% aged 16-25 compared to 44.2% aged 26-34, 36.9% aged 35-54 and 21.7% aged 55+) and in non-disabled people (39.6% compared to 21.2% with a disability).

The Sport England Active People Survey highlights, for Lewisham, that 69% of people surveyed want to do more sport.

Crime and Safety

Metropolitan Police Crime Statistics data for the rolling 12 month period to May 2015 indicates the total number of notifiable offences recorded. In New Cross, the rate of notifiable offences per 1,000 people was 122.2, compared to 80.6 in Lewisham and 85.4 in London, indicating a higher incidence of crime in New Cross.

Data is also broken down by the type of crime recorded. This highlights, as outlined in the following chart, that violence against the person and theft and handling are the most prevalent crimes, and in each case the incidence of these crimes being committed in New Cross was much higher than the average for both Lewisham and London:
Figure 23 – 12-month Rolling Notifiable Offences Recorded per 1,000 Residents, March 2013-March 2014 (Metropolitan Police, 2015):
**APPENDIX L - DOCUMENTS TO BE REFERRED TO**

1. **PLANNING POLICY**

   1.1 Lewisham Core Strategy (June 2011)

   1.2 Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (November 2014)

   1.3 London Plan (March 2015)

   1.4 National Planning Policy Framework

   1.5 National Planning Policy Guidance

   1.6 CIL Regulations 2010

   1.7 Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy (2010)

   1.8 Mayor of London’s Housing Strategy (2014)

   1.9 Mayor of London’s Air Quality Strategy (2010)

   1.10 Mayor of London’s Biodiversity Strategy (2002)


   1.13 Mayor of London’s Securing London’s Water Future (2011)

   1.14 Mayor of London’s Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (2014)

   1.15 Mayor of London’s London View Management Framework SPG (2012)

   1.16 Mayor of London’s Accessible London – Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (2014)

   1.17 Mayor of London’s Play and Informal Recreation SPG (2012)

   1.18 Mayor of London’s Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG (2007)

   1.19 Mayor of London’s Land for Industry and Transport SPG (2012)


   1.21 Mayor of London’s The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition SPG (2014)

   1.22 Mayor of London’s Social Infrastructure (2015)

   1.23 Mayor of London’s Housing Strategy (2015) and Draft Interim Housing SPG (2015)


   1.25 Lewisham Planning Obligations SPD (2015)

   1.26 Lewisham Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014
1.27 Lewisham Open Space Strategy (2012-2017)
1.28 Lewisham Tall Buildings Study (2012)
1.29 Millwall Building Heights Assessment (2010)
1.30 Hatcham Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)
1.31 Homes and Communities Agency’s Investment and Planning Obligations – Responding to the Downturn Good Practice Note (2009)
1.32 Tall buildings, Historic England Advice Note 4 (2015)
1.33 EIA Scoping Opinion July 2010 (ref: DC/10/74106)

2. REGENERATION/COMMUNITY POLICY
2.1 ‘People, prosperity, place’: Lewisham’s Regeneration Strategy 2008-2020
2.2 ‘Shaping our future’: Lewisham’s sustainable community strategy 2008-2020
2.3 Lewisham’s Asset Management Plan

3. GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE
3.1 Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Crichel Down Rules for the disposal of surplus land acquired by, or under the threat of, compulsion (DCLG, October 2015)

4. PLANNING PERMISSIONS/AGREEMENTS
4.1 Outline Planning Permission 30 March 2012
4.2 S73 Permission 18 December 2015
4.3 Section 106 Agreement 30 March 2012
4.4 Section 106 Agreement 18 December 2015

5. OTHER EVIDENCE/INFORMATION
5.1 Equalities Impact Assessment

6. COUNCIL CABINET AND COMMITTEE PAPERS
6.1 Cabinet Papers
   6.1.1 Agenda, Report and Minutes – [ ] 2015
   6.1.2 Agenda, Report and Minutes – 12 March 2012
6.2 Planning Committee Reports
   6.2.1 Agenda, Report and Minutes – [ ] 2012
   6.2.2 Agenda, Report and Minutes – [ ] 2013
   6.2.3 Agenda, Report and Minutes – [ ] 2015
7. **CONSULTATIONS**

7.1 Exhibitions, workshops, consultation reports etc

7.2 Consultation in relation to the outline planning application

7.3 Consultation in relation to the Section 73 application

7.4 Miscellaneous correspondence and consultation documentation
APPENDIX 3: S227 ACQUISITION PLAN
APPENDIX 4: S227 ACQUISITION HEADS OF TERMS
Heads of Terms for the acquisition of Renewal freehold land:

1. **Transaction Structure**: The proposed transaction will adopt the following structure:

   **Step 1**: **Agreement**: Renewal and LBL will enter into an agreement which will provide for:
   
   (a) The sale of freehold land owned by Renewal (whether existing or acquired in the future by private treaty outside of the CPO process) to the Council;
   
   (b) The grant of a long lease from the Council to Renewal;
   
   (c) The grant of an option for Renewal to purchase back the freehold land originally transferred to the Council.

   **Step 2**: **Transfer**: Completion of the transfer from Renewal to the Council.

   **Step 3**: **Leaseback**: Simultaneously with Step 2, completion of the grant of the long lease from the Council to Renewal.

   **Step 4**: **Buyback**: Exercise of the Option by Renewal and completion of the transfer of the freehold land from the Council to Renewal.

2. **Phased/Staged Transactions**: It is agreed and acknowledged that the Transaction Structure and steps set out at paragraph 1 above are to be capable of occurring on any number of occasions in respect of any Renewal freehold land within any Phase of the Development.

3. **Land to form part of the Acquisition**: The Acquisition Plan (contained at Appendix 3 of this Report) shades grey the land that is capable of being subject to acquisition by the Council.

4. **Consideration**: In respect of the consideration that will be payable in connection with the transactions:

   **Step 1**: No consideration will be payable by either the Council or Renewal in respect of the entering into of the Agreement.

   **Step 2**: The Council will pay Renewal £1 in respect of the transfer from Renewal to LBL.

   **Step 3**: Renewal will not make any payment to the Council in respect of the grant of the long lease from the Council to Renewal, and the lease will reserve only a peppercorn rent.

   **Step 4**: Renewal will pay the Council £1 in respect of the exercise of the Option and completion of the transfer of the freehold land from the Council to Renewal.

5. **Timings**: The timings for completion of each step as set out at paragraph 1 above are to be agreed between Renewal and the Council, and will in part be dictated by the acquisition of further freehold interests by Renewal. However, it is acknowledged that a sale and leaseback transaction between Renewal and the Council could be completed immediately after the Mayor & Cabinet resolution.
APPENDIX 5: PLAN OF RENEWAL’S EXISTING OWNERSHIPS
APPENDIX 6: TABLE OF FREEHOLD AND LEASEHOLD INTERESTS TO BE ACQUIRED, TOGETHER WITH PLANS OF FREEHOLD, HEAD LEASEHOLD, UNDERLEASEHOLD INTERESTS AND THIRD PARTY OWNERSHIP PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freehold Interest</th>
<th>Leasehold Interest</th>
<th>Underleasehold Interest</th>
<th>Third Party Ownership Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW BERMONDSEY
LAND INTERESTS TO BE ACQUIRED
Excludes any titles vested with utilities providers, occupational leases, unregistered land or land under contract.
As at: 04/02/2016

*TerraQuest Plan Reference: Please refer to Freehold (F/H) plan, Leasehold Head Lease (HL) plan or Leasehold Under Lease (UL) plan

PART A: ENTERPRISE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, BOLINA ROAD, LONDON SE16 3LF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH_5</td>
<td>TGL297100</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>L/H (125 years less 3 days) from 3 November 1987</td>
<td>Den Investments Limited (no. 05652498)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH_4</td>
<td>TGL299762</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>L/H (125 years less 3 days) from 3 November 1987</td>
<td>Den Investments Limited (no. 05652498)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: 2

PART B: BOLINA INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, BOLINA ROAD, LONDON SE16 3LF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH_17</td>
<td>TGL111556</td>
<td>Unit 29</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Mark Stephen Fogg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_13</td>
<td>SGL090523</td>
<td>Unit 31</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Hai Van Nguyen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_12</td>
<td>TGL14633</td>
<td>Unit 32</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Vi Van Duong</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_9</td>
<td>SGL457716</td>
<td>Unit 35</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Sylvanus Woodcraft Limited (no. 3797572)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_8</td>
<td>SGL461489</td>
<td>Unit 36</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Jia Cheng Wan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_6</td>
<td>TGL14652</td>
<td>Unit 38</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Dong Ping Wan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_5</td>
<td>TGL111553</td>
<td>Unit 39</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Vi Van Duong</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: 7

PART C: ORION BUSINESS CENTRE, SURREY CANAL ROAD, LONDON SE14 3RT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH_30</td>
<td>SGL199705</td>
<td>Units 1-25</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Guardwood Limited</td>
<td>1 (Minor Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL_24</td>
<td>SGL437309</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>L/H (999 years from 29 Sep 1983)</td>
<td>John David Berman, Lawrence Anthony Phillips, Beth Melanie Rinder and Frank Richard Lewis</td>
<td>2 (Minor Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL_16</td>
<td>SGL432327</td>
<td>Unit 4 and part Units 5 &amp; 6 in respect of the Yard</td>
<td>L/H (999 years from 29 Sep 1983)</td>
<td>George Peter Apter</td>
<td>3 (Minor Interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL_8</td>
<td>SGL433908</td>
<td>Unit 11</td>
<td>L/H (999 years from 29 Sep 1983)</td>
<td>Antonio Rocco</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL_18</td>
<td>SGL438666</td>
<td>Unit 19</td>
<td>L/H (999 years from 29 Sep 1983)</td>
<td>David Simmons</td>
<td>5 (Minor Interest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: 5

PART D: EXCELSIOR WORKS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, ROLLINS STREET, LONDON SE15 1EP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH_56</td>
<td>TGL5837</td>
<td>Units 10 &amp; 11</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Paul Robert Ervin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_58</td>
<td>TGL7613</td>
<td>Units 14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Giuseppe Fermi and Joseph Alan Partridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_60</td>
<td>TGL7641</td>
<td>Unit 17</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Willow Winston</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_54a</td>
<td>TGL404032</td>
<td>+ Land adjoining</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Thomas Ostenberg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_61</td>
<td>TGL14635</td>
<td>Unit 18 (formerly Units 18 &amp; 19)</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Giuseppe Fermi and Joseph Alan Partridge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH_62</td>
<td>TGL46819</td>
<td>Unit 19 (formerly Units 18 &amp; 19)</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Stephan John Floyd</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total: 6

PART E: STOCKHOLM ROAD, LONDON SE16 3LP - No interests to be acquired
PART F: ILDERTON WHarf, ROLLINS STREET, LONDON SE15 1EP - No interests to be acquired

PART G: LEWISHAM BC LAND (INCLUDING THE STADIUM AND LIONS CENTRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL_6</td>
<td>TGI90994</td>
<td>Football Stadium and car park</td>
<td>L/H (150 years from 24 June 1993)</td>
<td>The Millwall Football and Athletic Company (1985) plc</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL_5</td>
<td>TGI249139</td>
<td>Lion’s Centre</td>
<td>L/H (25 years from 19 November 2004)</td>
<td>Millwall Community Scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 2

PART H: NETWORK RAIL LAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH_67, FH_67a, FH_67b, FH_70, FH_72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Land in and around Surrey Canal</td>
<td>F/H</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 1

PART J: MASTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TerraQuest Plan Reference*</th>
<th>Title No.</th>
<th>Unit/Property</th>
<th>Title Type</th>
<th>Registered Owner</th>
<th>Rolling Count of Titles in third party ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HL_5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Land in and around Surrey Canal</td>
<td>L/H (20 years from 24 March 1993)</td>
<td>Vodafone Limited</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 1

SUMMARY ACROSS NEW BERMONDSEY

| Enterprise Industrial Estate | 2 |
| Botina Industrial Estate | 7 |
| Orion Business Centre | 5 (includes 4 Minor Interests) |
| Excelsior Industrial Estate | 6 |
| Stockholm Road | 0 |
| Ilderton Wharf | 0 |
| Lewisham BC Land | 2 |
| Network Rail Land | 1 |
| Masts | 1 |

Total Titles in third party ownership 24
APPENDIX 7: UTILITIES PLAN
Plan highlighting properties whose Rights of Light are interfered with by the New Bermondsey development

N.B. Plan excludes properties in the ownership of LB Lewisham
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REASONS FOR URGENCY AND LATENESS

Urgency: Given the significance of the financial constraints that the Council will face over the coming years, it is essential that the Mayor and his Cabinet are updated on any changes affecting the 2016/17 Budget prior to presenting it to Council. The reason for lateness was to ensure that any decisions taken by the Mayor & Cabinet on 10 February 2016 could be appropriately considered within this report.

Where a report is received less than 5 clear days before the date of the meeting at which the matter is being considered, then under the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100(b)(4) the Chair of the Committee can take the matter as a matter of urgency if he is satisfied that there are special circumstances requiring it to be treated as a matter of urgency. These special circumstances have to be specified in the minutes of the meeting.

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report presents the Mayor with updates to the main 2016/17 Budget Report presented to Mayor and Cabinet on 10 February 2016, and seeks the Mayor’s approval to finalise the recommended 2016/17 budget for consideration and agreement by the Council on 24 February 2016.

2. PURPOSE

2.1 The purpose of this report is to finalise the 2016/17 budget for consideration by the Council on 24 February 2016.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Mayor:

3.1 Agrees to recommend to Council a Band D Council Tax for 2016/17 of £1,102.66 for the Council’s element. This is an increase of 3.99% (including a social care precept of 2%), based on a General Fund Budget Requirement of £236.218m for 2016/17.
3.2 Notes and asks Council to note an overall increase in the total Council Tax for 2016/17 of 3.99% to include the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept being reduced by £19 to £276, a 6.4% reduction from its 2015/16 level as proposed.

3.3 Agrees to recommend to Council on 24 February 2016, the statutory calculation of the Budget Requirement for Lewisham for 2016/17, attached at Appendix A.

3.4 Agrees to recommend to Council on 24 February 2016, the motion on the budget, attached at Appendix B, including modifications made to the proposals published in the 2016/17 Budget Report.

3.5 Notes the provisional and estimated precept and levies from the GLA and other bodies as detailed in Appendix C and delegate authority to the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to include any changes to these in the report for Council.

3.6 Notes the final settlement figure of £146.691m announced on the 8 February 2016, which is the same as the provisional settlement figure.

3.7 Notes that there were no responses from Business rate payers to the consultation on the draft Budget which took place from 21 January 2016 to 4 February 2016.

3.8 Notes the updated equalities implications as set out in section 9 for the introduction of the Social Care precept as part of proposed Council Tax increases.

3.9 Considers the Section 25 Statement from the Chief Financial Officer. This is attached at Appendix D.

4. UPDATE ON THE COUNCIL’S CURRENT FINANCIAL POSITION

4.1 This report updates the main 2016/17 Budget Report through considering the following areas:
- Revenue Budget Savings and Funding Issues
- The Greater London Authority Precept
- Final Level of Council Tax

Revenue Budget Savings and Funding Issues

4.2 The impact of the final grant settlement and savings decisions taken at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of the 10 February and their impact on the statutory calculations in respect of Council Tax are set out in this section:

Final Settlement Funding Assessment

4.3 The Department for Communities and Local Government announced the final Local Government settlement figures on the 8 February 2016.

4.4 The Council’s total Settlement Funding Assessment for 2016/17 remains the same as the provisional figure announced on the 17 December 2015.
4.5 The Secretary of State announced in his speech to the House of Commons, that no council will receive less funding in 2016-17 than outlined in the provisional settlement. He also announced that Councils will have until 14 October 2016 to agree funding allocations for the remaining years of the Spending Review period (2017-18 to 2019-20).

**Update on other grants and future year’s strategy**

4.6 The Secretary of State announced that the Government will “conduct a review of what the needs assessment formula should be in a world in which all local government spending is funded by local resources not central grant, and use it to determine the transition to 100% business rates retention”, i.e. funding baselines will be recalculated with an updated assessment of need in time for 100 per cent retention.

4.7 The Government will also consult on the proposed new methodology allocations of the improved Better Care Fund from 2017/18, and on allowing well-performing planning departments to increase their fees in line with inflation.

**Overall Budget Position for 2016/17**

4.8 For 2016/17, the overall budget position for the Council is a General Fund Budget Requirement of £236.218m. The overall position is set out in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Overall Budget Position for 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) for 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax 2016/17 at 3.99% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus on Collection Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumed Budget Requirement for 2016/17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources available for 2016/17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget for 2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Reversal of reserves drawn in 15/16 (once off)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: additional Pay inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Non-pay Inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Grant adjustments for changes 15/16 to 16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Budget pressures to be funded from 16/17 fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong>: Risks and other potential budget pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: MRP and debt adjustment measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: Previously agreed savings for 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: New savings for 2015/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: Use of New Homes Bonus reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less</strong>: Once off use of provisions and reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risks**
4.9 Since preparing the draft budget report, a number of NHS hospitals have applied to be considered as charities for business rate purposes and that this be backdated for six years. If accepted, this would reduce their business rates by 80%. For Lewisham the impact would be a backdated payment in the region of £8m and an ongoing loss of business rates of approximately £1.5m. Guidance is being sought by the local government sector nationally as this could be expensive to the public purse if challenged and only serve to move money within the public sector. Officers will monitor the situation and keep members informed as part of preparing the medium term financial strategy for future years.

**Levies**

4.10 There are three bodies which charge a levy against Lewisham’s Council Tax: the London Pensions Fund Authority (LPFA); the Environment Agency; and the Lee Valley Park Authority. Formal notification from the Environment Agency has been received, and officers have estimated the levy for the LPFA and the Lee Valley Park Authority and assumed no change. The detail for these levies is provided in Appendix C. The Council’s ‘relevant basic’ amount of Council Tax has been calculated and results in a 3.99% increase for 2016/17.

**The Greater London Authority Precept**

4.11 On the 21 January, the Mayor of London’s draft budget was announced. The proposed 2016/17 GLA precept for Band D is £276. This represents a reduction of £19 from its 2015/16 level. The final announcement is due after the 22 February (the date the London Assembly will consider the Mayor’s budget), and officers have assumed no change to the precept already announced.

4.12 Accordingly, the Mayor is asked to agree to recommend to Council on 24 February 2016, the motion, attached at Appendix B.

**Final Level of Council Tax**

4.13 Table 2 shows Lewisham’s overall Council Tax Calculation for 2016/17 and calculation of the Council Tax for Band D for 2016/17, based on the recommended budget requirement of £236,218m.

**Table 2: Calculation of Council Tax Requirement and Band D based on spend of £236,218m for 2016/17.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Budget Requirement for 2016/17</td>
<td>236,218,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Revenue Support Grant</td>
<td>59,608,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Baseline Funding Level</td>
<td>87,082,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong> Surplus in collection fund</td>
<td>2,937,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax requirement</td>
<td><strong>86,590,324</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divide by:</strong> Council Tax Base</td>
<td>78,528.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax for Lewisham Services (Band D)</td>
<td>1,102.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.14 The final calculation of Council Tax for different Council Tax bands is shown in Table 3, based on the Band D calculated in Table 2.

### Table 3: Council Tax for different Council Tax Bands in 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Tax Band</th>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Lewisham Council Tax</th>
<th>GLA Precept</th>
<th>Total Council Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>735.11</td>
<td>184.00</td>
<td>919.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>857.62</td>
<td>214.67</td>
<td>1,072.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8/9</td>
<td>980.14</td>
<td>245.33</td>
<td>1,225.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>1,102.66</td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>1,378.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11/9</td>
<td>1,347.69</td>
<td>337.33</td>
<td>1,685.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>13/9</td>
<td>1,592.73</td>
<td>398.67</td>
<td>1,991.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15/9</td>
<td>1,837.76</td>
<td>460.00</td>
<td>2,297.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>18/9</td>
<td>2,205.32</td>
<td>552.00</td>
<td>2,757.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

4.15 This report sets out the updated information for the Mayor to make recommendations to Council to set the 2016/17 budget. This includes finalising the statutory requirements to allow Council to make final decisions on 24 February 2016.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 This entire report is concerned with the Council’s budget.

6. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 For the legal implications, these are set out in detail in the main 2016/17 Budget Report and the 2016/17 Revenue Budget Savings Report presented to Mayor & Cabinet on 10 February 2016 and 30 September 2015 respectively.

7. **HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no specific human resources implications directly arising from this report. Any human resources implications have been set out in the main budget report.

8. **CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**
8.1 There are no specific crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report. Any crime and disorder implications have been set out in the main budget report.

9. **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 The Council is proposing to increase Council Tax by 1.99% within the referendum limit and a further 2% as a social care precept. In proposing to increase Council Tax in 2016/17, the Council must have regard to the equalities implications of so doing, both in terms of raising and then spending this additional money. This has been done as described below. Overall there will be a positive equalities impact for the elderly and disabled in Lewisham as a consequence of these proposals.

9.2 In respect of raising additional Council Tax there are no new equality impacts for any of the identified characteristics because Council Tax is raised from all households in line with existing national arrangements. There are also no new equality impacts for any of the identified characteristics from the 1.99% increase as the £1.65m will be spent on the Council's general services for the benefit of the population as a whole.

9.3 There are positive equality impacts for some of the identified characteristics from the 2% social care increase as this £1.67m will be ring fenced for spending on those in receipt of adult social care. In particular, by definition the characteristics of age and disability.

9.4 To put this in context; Lewisham's population was identified as being 276,000 (census 2011) of whom 9.5% were 65 years or older and 14.5% were living with a long term condition (a proxy for disability).

9.5 In terms of adult social care in 2014/15 (the latest annual figures available) the Council;
- supported the following:
  - 1,713 Carers needs were considered or reviewed
  - 1,510 Peoples needs were assessed and 629 new assessments undertaken
  - 1,000 People were in receipt of Direct Payments and 100 Carers received a Direct Payment
  - 2,240 People were in receipt of a Personal Budget
  - 900 People were placed in permanent residential placements
  - 180 People were admitted to nursing care.

- spending £81.5m on adult social care services spend, directed as follows:
  - Mental Health - 5%
  - Physical Disability - 9%
  - Other Services - 18%
  - Learning Disability - 33%
  - Older People - 35%.
9.6 There are no other specific equalities implications arising from this report beyond those set out and considered by Mayor & Cabinet on the 10 February in the 2016/17 Budget Report and 2016/17 Revenue Budget Savings Report.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no specific environmental implications directly arising from this report. Any environmental implications have been set out in the main budget report.

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND ORIGINATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title of Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Budget Report</td>
<td>Mayor &amp; Cabinet 10 February 2016</td>
<td>5th Floor Laurence House</td>
<td>David Austin</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information on this report please contact:

Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration on 020 8314 8013
David Austin, Head of Corporate Resources on 020 8314 9114
APPENDIX A

Statutory Calculations

1) It be noted that at its meeting on 20 January 2016, the Council calculated the number of **78,528.58** as its Council Tax base for 2016/17 in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Taxbase) Regulations;

2) The following amounts are now calculated by the Council for the year 2016/17 in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

a. **£977,472,136** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for gross expenditure, calculated in accordance with Section 32(2)A of the Act;

b. **£741,254,007** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for income, calculated in accordance with Section 32(3)A of the Act;

c. **£236,218,129** being the amount by which the aggregate of 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate of 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32A(4) of the Act, as its General Fund budget requirement for the year;

d. **£146,690,805** being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of the Settlement Funding Assessment.

e. **£89,527,324** being the residual amount required to be collected from Council Tax payers. This includes the surplus on the Council's Collection Fund of **£2,937,000**.

f. **£1,102.66** being the residual sum at (e) above (less the surplus on the Collection Fund), divided by the Council Tax base of **78,528.58** which is Lewisham’s precept on the Collection Fund for 2016/17 at the level of Band D;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Council Tax (LBL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>735.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>857.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>980.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><strong>1,102.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,347.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,592.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1,837.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,205.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (f) above by the number which, in proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council in
acccordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands;

3) It be noted that for the year 2016/17, the Greater London Authority is currently consulting on the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended), for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>GLA Precept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>214.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>245.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>337.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>398.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>552.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Having calculated the estimated aggregate amount in each case of the amounts at 2) (f) and 3) above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, assumed the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2016/17 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Total Council Tax (LBL &amp; GLA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>919.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,072.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,225.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1,378.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,685.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,991.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2,297.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,757.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

MOTION FOR THE MAYOR TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

Having considered:

(i) an officer report, the comments of the Public Accounts Select Committee of 27 January 2016, and a presentation from the Cabinet Member for Resources;

(ii) the final Settlement Funding Assessment figures released by the Department for Communities and Local Government on the 8 February 2016;

(iii) the views of those consulted on the budget as required and subject to proper process and consultation;

The Mayor, from the options available, is asked to:

**Capital Programme**

3.1 note and ask Council to note the 2015/16 Quarter 3 Capital Programme monitoring position as set out in section 5 of this report;

3.2 recommend that Council approves the 2016/17 to 2019/20 Capital Programme of £337.2m, as set out in section 5 of this report and attached at Appendices W1 and W2;

**Housing Revenue Account**

3.3 note and ask Council to note the consultation report on service charges to tenants and leaseholders in the Brockley area, presented to area panel members on 17th December 2015, and subsequent postal consultation, as attached at Appendix X2;

3.4 note and ask Council to note the consultation report on service charges to tenants and leaseholders and the Lewisham Homes budget strategy presented to area panel members on 17th December 2015, as attached at Appendix X3;

3.5 recommend that Council sets a decrease in dwelling rents of 1.0% (an average of £0.99 per week) – as per the requirements from government as presented in section 6 of this report;

3.6 recommend that Council sets a decrease in the hostels accommodation charge by 1.0% (or £0.39 per week), in accordance with Government requirements;

3.7 recommend that Council approves the following average weekly increases for dwellings for:

3.9.1 service charges to non-Lewisham Homes managed dwellings (Brockley);
• caretaking  1.80% (£0.06)
• grounds    1.80% (£0.03)
• communal lighting 1.80% (£0.01)
• bulk waste collection 1.80% (£0.02)
• window cleaning 1.80% (£0.09)
• tenants’ levy  -30.0% (-£0.03)

3.9.2 service charges to Lewisham Homes managed dwellings:

• caretaking  1.20% (£0.07)
• grounds    68.0% (£0.66)
• window cleaning No increase
• communal lighting -10.7% (-£0.13)
• block pest control -4.3% (-£0.07)
• waste collection No change
• heating & hot water  23.1% (£1.85)
• tenants’ levy  -30.0% (-£0.03)
• bulk waste disposal new service (£0.81)
• sheltered housing new service (£23.62)

3.10 recommend that Council approves the following average weekly percentage changes for hostels and shared temporary units for:

• service charges (hostels) – caretaking etc.; 2.90% (£2.09)
• no energy cost increases for heat, light & power; 0.0% (£0.00)
• water charges decrease; -5.26% (-£0.01)

3.11 recommend that Council approves an increase in garage rents by Retail Price Inflation (RPI) of 0.80% (£0.09 per week) for Brockley residents and 0.80% (£0.09 per week) for Lewisham Homes residents;

3.12 note and ask Council to note that the budgeted expenditure for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2016/17 is £167.6m which includes the capital and new build programmes;

3.13 agree and ask Council to endorse the HRA budget strategy savings proposals in order to achieve a balanced budget in 2016/17, as attached at Appendix X1;

**Dedicated Schools Grant and Pupil Premium**

3.14 agree to recommend to Council, subject to final confirmation of the allocation, that the provisional Dedicated Schools Grant allocation of £283.5m be the Schools’ Budget for 2016/17; and

• Note the consultation with schools on the changes to the funding arrangements for High Needs Pupils as set out in paragraph 7.12;
• Note the level of pupil premium anticipated for 2016/17 of £18.0m
General Fund Revenue Budget

3.15 note and ask Council to note the projected overall variance against the agreed 2015/16 revenue budget of £6.9m as set out in section 8 of this report and that any year-end overspend will have to be met from reserves;

3.16 endorse and ask Council to endorse the previously approved revenue budget savings of £6.462m for 2016/17 and budget savings proposals of £10.752 as per the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of the 30 September 2015, as set out in section 8 of the report and summarised in Appendix Y1 and Y2;

3.17 agree and ask Council to agree the transfer of £5.0m in 2016/17 from the New Homes Bonus reserve to the General Fund for one year to meet funding shortfalls and that the position be reviewed again for 2017/18;

3.18 agree and ask Council to agree the use of £5.942m reserves to meet the budget gap in 2016/17;

3.19 agree and ask Council to agree to fund budget pressures in the sum of £3.750m in 2016/17;

3.20 agree and ask Council to agree to create a fund in respect of as yet unquantified revenue budget risks in the sum of £3.750m in 2016/17, allowing the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration to hold these resources corporately in case these pressures emerge during the year, and authorises the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to allocate these funds to meet such pressures when satisfied that those pressures cannot be contained within the Directorates’ cash limits;

3.21 agree to recommend to Council that a General Fund Budget Requirement of £236.218m for 2016/17 be approved, based on a 3.99% increase in Lewisham’s Council Tax element. This will result in a Band D equivalent Council Tax level of £1,102.66 for Lewisham’s services and £1,378.66 overall. This represents an overall increase in Council Tax for 2016/17 of 1.72% and is subject to the GLA precept for 2016/17 being reduced by 6.44% from its existing level, in line with the GLA’s draft proposal;

3.22 note and ask Council to note the Council Tax Ready Reckoner which for illustrative purposes sets out the Band D equivalent Council Tax at various levels of increase. This is explained in section 8 of the report and set out in more detail in Appendix Y3 of the Budget Report;

3.23 recommend that Council ask the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration to issue cash limits to all Directorates once the 2016/17 Revenue Budget is agreed;

3.24 note and ask Council to note the Chief Financial Officer’s Section 25 Statement attached as Appendix D to this report;
3.25 agree and ask Council to agree the statutory calculations for 2016/17 as set out at Appendix A of this report;

3.26 note and ask Council to note the prospects for the revenue budget for 2017/18 and future years as set out in section 9 of the Budget Report;

3.27 agree that officers continue to develop firm proposals as part of the Lewisham Future Programme to help meet the forecast budget shortfalls;

**Other Grants (within the General Fund)**

3.28 note and ask Council to note the adjustments to and impact of various specific grants for 2016/17 on the General Fund as set out in section 8 of the Budget report;

**Treasury Management Strategy**

3.29 agree and recommend that Council approves the prudential indicators and treasury limits, as set out in section 10 of the Budget report;

3.30 agree and recommend that Council approves the 2016/17 treasury strategy, including; the potential for debt restructuring and opportunity to invest for longer than one year in pooled property funds, along with the investment strategy and the credit worthiness policy, as set out at Appendix Z3;

3.31 agree and recommend that Council approves the revised Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy as set out in section 10 of the Budget report.

3.32 agree and recommend that Council agrees to delegate to the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration authority during 2016/17 to make amendments to borrowing and investment limits provided they are consistent with the strategy and there is no change to the Council’s authorised limit for borrowing;

3.33 agree and recommend that Council approves the credit and counterparty risk management criteria, as set out at Appendix Z3, the proposed countries for investment at Appendix Z4, and that it formally delegates responsibility for managing transactions with those institutions which meet the criteria to the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration; and

3.34 agree and recommend that Council approves a minimum sovereign rating of AA-;

3.35 agree and recommend that Council approves a change to the yellow and purple durational investment bands from 1 to 2 years in the credit worthiness policy.
# RELEVANT AMOUNTS OF COUNCIL TAX AND LEVIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Amount of Council Tax</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Base</td>
<td>75,526.1</td>
<td>78,528.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Requirement with Levy (£)</td>
<td>80,084,100</td>
<td>86,590,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Amount of Council Tax (£)</td>
<td>1,060.35</td>
<td>1,102.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Increase in basic amount of Council Tax</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy bodies for Lewisham</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPFA (Estimated)</td>
<td>£1,231,690</td>
<td>£1,231,690</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley Regional Park (Estimated)</td>
<td>£226,676</td>
<td>£226,676</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>£172,889</td>
<td>£178,500</td>
<td>£5,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Levies</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,631,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,636,866</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5,611</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Y4: Chief Financial Officer’s Section 25 Statement

1. This statement makes reference to the 2016/17 Budget Report to Mayor & Cabinet circulated to all Members.

2. Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 requires the Chief Financial Officer to report to an authority when it is making the statutory calculations required to determine its Council Tax. The Authority is required to take the report into account when making the calculations. The report must deal with the robustness of the estimates, included in the budget and the adequacy of the reserves, for which the budget provides. This Statement also reflects the requirements of CIPFA’s current Local Authority Accounting Panel (LAAP) Bulletin 77 on ‘Local Authority Reserves and Balances’.

3. Section 114 of the Local Government Act 1988, requires the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to issue a report to all the Local Authority members to be made by that officer, in consultation with the monitoring officer and head of paid service, if there is or is likely to be unlawful expenditure or an unbalanced budget.

Generally

4. The Council has already made savings from its revenue budget of £121m since May 2010. The Medium Term Financial Strategy was reported to Mayor & Cabinet in July 2015. This set out that an estimated £83m of savings is required from 2016/17 to 2019/20. Based on the local government finance settlement, including maximum Council Tax increases for each of the next four years, and using largely the same assumptions as set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy this estimate reduces to £75m. To date proposals for £33m have been presented for scrutiny and to Mayor & Cabinet.

5. The final Local Government Finance Settlement on 8 February 2016 announced a one year settlement for 2016/17. This confirmed the need for £29.2m of savings in 2016/17. The estimates for 2017/18 to 2019/20 may vary depending on future year settlements and the outcomes to consultations due for a number of areas impacting local government finance. Current forecasts expect the Council to need to find in the region of a further £45m of savings for the four years to 2019/20.

6. The Council continues to take a prudent approach towards financial planning. During these times, the Council will need to weigh up the need to hold reserves and balances whilst going through this period of increased risk to the delivery of the budget versus the need to use reserves and balances when considering the need to set a balanced budget. This is even more important for 2016/17 as, following the government’s Comprehensive Spending Review and Local Government Finance Settlement in 2015, a number of fundamental changes are proposed to the way in which local government will be financed. The emphasis of these changes is focused on local authorities becoming more self-sufficient and less reliant on central government grant.
Pressures on the Council’s Revenue Budget in 2016/17

7. During 2015/16 there have been a number of pressures which have crystallised due to increasing demographics and legislative changes. Namely; individuals presenting with no recourse to public funds, looked after children, and demand for temporary accommodation. Consideration is given in the report to the management and funding of these risks.

8. In setting this budget, the Council will maintain a level of corporate balances and reserves which should be adequate to deal with any risk associated with the delivery of this budget. That said there are still considerable risks associated with delivering the scale of savings required. The Chief Financial Officer recommends that the un-earmarked reserves are held at the current level of £13.0m. Should the need arise to call upon these reserves during the year, consideration should be given to replenish them as soon as possible.

9. In addition, the Council held Specific Earmarked Reserves which total £69m at the 31 March 2015. These funds are earmarked for various future planned spending and to undertake one-off projects or work that does not happen every year. Examples include, the transitional fund, redundancy provisions, elections, replacement of obsolete equipment and contractual claims that may become due (e.g. dilapidations that may become payable on properties we lease from the private sector to provide housing).

10. The 2016/17 budget pressures have been outlined in the main budget report. These include a range of pressures, some of which cannot be quantified at this stage, and include: demographic pressures for children and adult services; redundancy and further potential changes to funding as a result of government legislation and reform. These funds will either be transferred to the Directorate budgets where quantifiable and not thought to be directly controllable at the start of the year or held corporately until such time as the pressure emerges during the year.

Budget assumptions

Inflation

11. For financial planning purposes, the Council continues to anticipate the environment of public sector pay restraint to continue and assume an average pay inflation of 1% per annum, which equates to approximately £1.1m. Negotiations in 2015 confirmed a pay offer of 1.0% from the 1 April 2016. While not yet formerly agreed, funding for this increase is provided within the budget.

12. The Council applies a notional non-pay inflation level of 2.5% per annum which equates to approximately £2.7m on net non-pay expenditure.

13. Moving forward, officers will need to closely monitor inflationary pressure on contracts, which in many cases, continue to outstrip the current level of Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation. In particular, this applies to those areas which are viewed as being particularly sensitive to contract price changes, such as Adult Social Care, or with long term fixed rate contracts, such as the range of PFI contracts which the Council is currently engaged with.
Budget Risks

Capital Programme

14. The risks related to the Capital Programme are managed programme-wide and scheme by scheme. Officers review anticipated capital receipts quarterly, the last review was carried out in January 2016. Projections are updated and reported on regularly to Mayor & Cabinet.

Service volume pressure

15. The Council continues to maintain a medium term financial strategy and corporate budget model by which it attempts to identify and anticipate financial pressures.

16. With regards to the overall financial standing of the authority, issues concerning the level of borrowing and debt outstanding are considered in section ten of the 2016/17 Budget Report.

Business Rates Retention

17. This is the fourth local government finance settlement under the new ‘business rate retention’ funding system. There is now an increased emphasis on local authorities to grow their business activities locally. Councils retain 30% of locally collected business rates, but have no discretion to vary the rateable value or ‘multiplier’, (i.e. the pound charged per rateable value). This element makes up 17% of the total baseline funding received by Lewisham in respect of business rates in the financial settlement.

18. Each local authority is given an indicative target of business rates yield against which growth will be judged. Councils will be able to retain a share of any growth in business rate income and therefore have a direct financial incentive to promote growth in their local economies. Conversely, any decline in business rates will also be borne by the authority and will negatively impact upon income levels.

Savings

Identifying savings

19. The Council, through the Lewisham Future Programme, continues to look at reshaping the Council over the medium term. This Programme recognises that in the sixth consecutive year of spending reductions even greater innovation, focus on the customer, and cross-cutting thinking is required to deliver savings. This whilst attempting to minimise the impacts on residents and customers for Lewisham Council services.

20. The Programme comprises a mixture of thematic and cross-cutting reviews. Some examples of these include: smarter assessment arrangements and deeper integration of social & health care, including public health; approach to safeguarding and early intervention services; opportunities for asset rationalisation; a strategic review of income generation and the drive to make further reductions in management and corporate overheads.

21. The 2014/15 and 2015/16 budgets were supported by the use of reserves. The 2016/17 budget makes use of once off resources from New Homes Bonus of £5.0m and £5.9m of earmarked reserves. Going forward, ongoing measures will need to be put in place to ensure the sustainability of the budget.
Implementing savings

22. There is a risk that one or more budget savings, in full or in part, may not be delivered on time in the year. The Council operates financial management on the principle of devolved responsibility for budgets to managers in Directorates. This is managed through the monthly budget monitoring process with quarterly updates provided in the budget monitoring reports for members. The extent to which any anticipated savings are not delivered adds to future pressures.

Control

23. Going forward into 2016/17 the Council will continue to maintain its strong systems for monitoring expenditure and controlling expenditure through Directorate cash limits.

24. During 2015/16 instructions to budget managers were re-affirmed to ensure tight spending on budgets and focus on ensuring the Council’s budget position remains within budget at the year-end. However, throughout the year the Council has forecast a persistent overspending position. While this has been reduced, the forecast outturn position for the year at the December 2015 was an overspend of £6.9m. This will likely reduce further with the application of the unallocated element of the risk and pressures monies in the 2015/16 budget. Any overspend at the end of the financial year will have to be met from once off resources.

25. For 2016/17, the budget holders within Directorates are again being requested to endorse their cash limits before the start of the financial year and provide confirmation of an ability to deliver their services within the agreed allocated resources. At this stage it is expected that the Departmental Expenditure Panels and the Corporate Expenditure Panel will continue into 2016/17 and this will be kept under review.

26. Given the forecast outturn position in 2015/16, the level of savings required for 2016/17 and the anticipated significant level of savings/cuts required in the years beyond; it remains critically important to monitor the progress being made in implementing these savings throughout the year.

Conclusion

27. The Council has a robust and sophisticated approach for producing and maintaining its annual budget. Its financial plans and strategies have contributed to the achievement of the Council’s corporate objectives to date.

28. The Council has drawn on once-off resources in 2014/15, 2015/16, and will do so again in 2016/17. This approach has been used to allow the Council to identify and implement cost reduction and transformational changes in a measured way. However, it does need to be recognised that this is not sustainable over the long term as continued use of reserves, if unplanned, could reduce the resilience of the Council to respond flexibly to unforeseen expenditure or continued resource reduction.

29. 2015/16 was the sixth consecutive year the Council has made sustained budget reductions and with the local finance settlement for 2016/17 we know this will continue for at least a further four years. The measures taken to date have, in the main, been successful. However, the identification and implementation of savings is becoming more challenging and taking longer to achieve. This pressure is
expected to continue and tight control will need to be exercised over the budget for 2016/17 given the level of risk the Council faces. As well as managing within budget, attention also needs to continue to be focussed on identifying the savings necessary to achieve a balanced budget in future years.

30. The use of once off resources on a continuous basis to balance the annual budget is not sustainable and could quickly lead to the depletion of reserves. Should the Council find itself in a position where it does not have the resources to meet expenditure this would lead to the consideration of a Section 114 notice. Whilst the Council does currently have adequate reserves and a robust financial management regime, the budget preparation for both the short and medium term must remain a priority.

Janet Senior – Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration
Chief Financial Officer – Section 151

February 2016
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1. **Summary**
   This report updates the Mayor on the proposal that Sir Francis Drake Primary School (SFD) should be enlarged from 1 to 2 Forms of Entry through a building provided by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) through the Priority Schools Building Programme.

2. **Purpose**
   The report sets out how the condition has been met that the school should be enlarged subject to the development of a suitable building scheme and to request the Mayor’s agreement that certain items not included in the EFA specification should be funded by the Local Authority.

3. **Recommendations**
   The Mayor is recommended to:

   3.1 Note the successful conclusion of a series of contractor engagements and consultations in partnership with the Education Funding Agency and the final building proposal agreed.

   3.2 Note that the requirement to consult more widely with Councillors, the governing body, parents and neighbouring boroughs has been met

   3.3 Ratify the decision to expand Sir Francis Drake Primary from 1 to 2FE for 2017 in accordance with the building proposals concluded in partnership with the Education Funding Agency;

   3.4 Approve additional expenditure to a maximum of £225,000, to support additional site and planning requirements.
4. **Policy Context**

4.1 The proposals within this report are consistent with ‘Shaping Our Future: Lewisham’s Sustainable Community Strategy’ and the Council’s corporate priorities. In particular, they relate to the Council’s priorities regarding young people’s achievement and involvement, including inspiring and supporting young people to achieve their potential, the protection of children and young people and ensuring efficiency, effectiveness and equity in the delivery of excellent services to meet the needs of the community.

4.2 The Local Authority has a duty to ensure the provision of sufficient places for pupils of statutory school age and, within financial constraints, accommodation that is both suitable and in good condition.

4.3 In aiming to improve on the provision of facilities for primary education in Lewisham which are appropriate for the 21st century, the implementation of a successful primary places strategy will contribute to the delivery of the corporate priority Young people’s achievement and involvement: raising educational attainment and improving facilities for young people through partnership working.

4.4 It supports the delivery of Lewisham’s Children & Young People’s Plan (CYPP), which sets out the Council’s vision for improving outcomes for all children and young people, and in so doing reducing the achievement gap between our most disadvantaged pupils and their peers. It also articulates the objective of improving outcomes for children with identified SEN and disabilities by ensuring that their needs are met.

5. **Proposal to enlarge Sir Francis Drake Primary School from 1 to 2 forms of entry**

5.1 On January 15th 2014 Mayor & Cabinet received a report which *inter alia* reported on an opportunity to enlarge SFD as part of the measures to meet the demand for primary places in the Deptford and New Cross Primary Place Planning Locality.

5.2 At the Mayor & Cabinet meeting of 9 April 2014, the Mayor agreed a consultation on the proposal to enlarge SFD from 1 to 2 Forms of Entry, and to admit 60 pupils with effect from September 2016, subject to the development of satisfactory building proposals in partnership with the EFA. The collaboration required the EFA to project manage the procurement and construction of the building, and the LA to undertake the statutory process to enlarge the school.

5.3 On 25 June 2014, following the completion of the statutory consultation process, the Mayor agreed to the proposal to enlarge SFD from 1 to 2 forms of entry with effect from September 2016, subject to the development of satisfactory building proposals in partnership with the EFA.
5.4 On 16 July 2014 the Mayor agreed a proposal from the Overview & Scrutiny Education Business Panel that he should instruct officers to fully engage both Ward Councillors and Councillors with relevant responsibilities if there were any proposal for the use of Parks. The Mayor also agreed a proposal that, since at the time no detailed plans were available, there should be a further report to Mayor and Cabinet, and the respective Scrutiny Committee, following close working with the governing body, parents and neighbouring boroughs in the finalisation of detailed proposals.

5.5 The EFA then embarked on the development of building proposals and a contractor engagement process with the school. Although a scheme was developed the EFA considered that it did not offer value for money and it did not proceed. Some initial discussions were held to establish the viability of using Deptford Park as outdoor space for the school but proposals were not implemented since there was no guarantee that the EFA would progress the scheme.

5.6 At the Mayor & Cabinet meeting on July 15th 2015, the Mayor agreed to defer the enlargement of Sir Francis Drake Primary School for a further academic year to September 2017, and reinstate the Determined Admissions Limit for 2016/17 to the current intake of 30 pupils.

5.7 The EFA identified a new contractor and design team, and in September 2015 launched a further contractor engagement process with the school, with the local authority Planning department and with the Children & Young People department.

5.8 This has resulted in a different proposal for a new building to replace the current time-expired accommodation and to increase the capacity of the school to two forms of entry. The building meets the DFE recommendations for a 2FE Primary school as set out in Building Bulletin 103. The Design team visited Sir Francis Drake before embarking on a proposal. Following conversations with the governors and Head teacher they took as their starting point the view onto a courtyard from the current hall and have referenced that in the proposals which will shortly be submitted for planning.

5.9 Local Councillors have been briefed throughout and the school community kept in touch through the school website and newsletters. The school, Planners and Children & Young People have been involved throughout. Kier, the proposed contractor, has sought a dialogue with Planners as part of their pre-application consultations, including proposals for construction management and impact on traffic.

5.10 Public consultation
There have been two opportunities for public consultation. Both have been supported by illustrations and a model of the proposed layout. These materials have been left at the school for their use.

5.10.1 A pre-application public drop-in session was organised on Monday 30th November 2015. This offered attendees the opportunity for discussion rather than a formal meeting. The discussion covered the following topics.
- Scheme design
- Management of neighbour issues such as traffic and the Neptune Works development
- Project timetable

The session lasted from 3.30 to 7.00 and was attended by approximately 30 people. Overall, there was a positive response to the scheme.

5.10.2 A further drop-in session was held on January 19th 2016 when representatives of the local authority, Kier and the EFA were available to meet with parents and local residents to answer questions about the proposal. The meeting was publicised by the school through newsletters, the school website and twitter. The session lasted from 3.30 to 6.00 and was attended by approximately 10 parents/carers and their children..

5.11.1 Opponents of the development of Sir Francis Drake attending the meetings criticise the standard of the proposed building and the need for places. They felt that the building could be improved by the use of Section 106/CIL funding.

5.11.2 As stated above (5.7) the building meets the construction recommendations for all new schools and is not sub-standard. The EFA funding model does not include a small number of items which have been standard in Lewisham primary, neither does it include borough-specific planning conditions. This report includes a recommendation that the Mayor should agree to fund legitimate additional items as set out in the table in paragraph 5.14. Officers are satisfied that the proposed school is a significant improvement on the previous scheme and will offer many opportunities for developing the delivery of the curriculum.

5.12.1 Opposers also questioned whether the re-opening of the old Charlotte Turner primary (now named Invicta Primary) in Greenwich meant that the places were no longer required.

5.12.2 Officers are in regular contact across boroughs and must be consulted when school organisation changes are proposed. Invicta was re-opened by Greenwich to meet the projected pupil needs in the locality. Some children resident in Lewisham but close to Invicta may benefit on a distance criterion for admission into the school, but this will not be a sufficient number to meet overall demand in the New Cross and Deptford Planning area. Sir Francis Drake is immediately adjacent to Neptune Wharf and without additional places at the school families in areas who would have expected that their children would attend Sir Francis Drake might have been displaced unless they had an older child already on roll. The Housing Trajectory published in December 2015 states that 6,664 new housing units are to be constructed in Evelyn Ward over the next decade. The enlargement of Sir Francis Drake is part of the measures to ensure that the borough will be able to meet its statutory obligation to ensure the supply of sufficient school places.

5.13 A Planning Application was submitted on December 23rd 2015 (DC/15/094990). This provides detailed plans of the proposed building. As a Planning Application can be withdrawn, this does not fetter the Mayor’s discretion. This report and the Mayor’s decision will be subject to the Overview and Scrutiny process. The Planning Application will be determined by the Planning Committee.
5.14 Under the current proposal, the school will remain on site during the construction period but will not be able to use the Key Stage 2 playground which is where the new building is to be located. The construction side will be hoarded off and there will be a complete segregation of activities and agreed times for deliveries to site.

5.15 During the construction period the school will be using a discrete area of Deptford Park as a play area. Officers in CYP are in discussion with the Parks team. This will be fenced and a protective surface will be laid over the grass. Once the new building and the landscaped playground are complete the park will be restored to its previous condition. These costs will be met by the EFA. Local residents will be reassured that this is only a temporary arrangement.

5.16 The following table sets out a number of items which are included at the request of the school or because they are standard features in Lewisham-led developments. The EFA is prepared to include these in the specification if they are funded by the LA or the school. In addition the EFA have stated that they will not meet the cost of any planning conditions such as traffic calming measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Planning conditions</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy Reception classes</td>
<td>35,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy Year 1 classes</td>
<td>30,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast Sinks in Reception, Year 1, Year 2 classrooms</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattressing for high level school signage</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>19,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.17 Other “extra-over” items including an acoustic sliding partition between the hall and the studio and interconnecting classroom doors between the Reception classes are under discussion and may be joint funded if there is sufficient headroom in the amounts in the table above.

6 Capital Financial implications

6.1 In the period 2008/09 to 2017/18 the Government has made £125.5m Basic Need grant available. In addition the Council has secured other grants of £24.65m and identified £7.8m of Section 106 monies to support the programme this with Council resources of £1.9m makes the total resources...
available over the period of £159.9m. Against these resources, the value of works estimated to be necessary is £154.5m to September 2017: this leaves a balance of £5.4m toward future schemes. The programme is therefore in balance for schemes to be delivered for September 2017.

6.2. The costs for the construction of Sir Francis Drake were intended to be met through the government’s Priority Schools Building Programme. However it is now clear that the EFA will not pick up additional costs resulting from Extra-over planning permission requirements. While the costs for these cannot be accurately determined at this stage, an allowance of £250k has been made in the expenditure forecasts set out in 6.1 above to fund any contribution toward costs as a result of those measures. The Governing Body has raised concerns about the facilities to be provided as part of the build and asked that the local authority address these. No commitments have been made at this stage but discussions will continue if the proposals proceed as agreed.

6.3 Although the LA had hoped to secure a rebuilt and expanded school at no cost, the contribution likely to be made will be a small proportion of the costs and could not be otherwise achieved with the resources available currently to the Council.

6.4 The construction works will provide an additional 30 places in September 2017 rising to a total of 210 additional places over the next 7 years.

6.5. Although the project is delayed the EFA have taken steps to ensure delivery in September 2017. On this basis, it is recommended that the funds identified to meet the costs of any site and planning requirements should continue to be held for the project.

6.6 Revenue Financial Implications

The revenue costs of running the fully expanded accommodation will be funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant with no burden falling on the General Fund resources of the Council.

7 Legal Implications

7.1 The Human Rights Act 1998 safeguards the rights of children in the Borough to educational provision, which the Council is empowered to provide in accordance with its duties under domestic legislation.

7.2 Section 14 of the Education Act 1996 oblige each local authority to ensure that there are sufficient primary and secondary schools available for its area i.e. the London Borough of Lewisham, although there is no requirement that those places should be exclusively in the borough. The Authority is not itself obliged to provide all the schools required, but to secure that they are available.

7.3 In exercising its responsibilities under section 14 of the Education Act 1996 a local authority must do so with a view to securing diversity in the provision of schools and increasing opportunities for parental choice.
7.4 Section 19 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 provides that where a local authority proposes to make a prescribed alteration to a maintained school and it is permitted to make that alteration, it must publish proposals.

7.5 The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2013 provide that proposed enlargements of school premises which would increase the capacity of the school by more than 30 pupils and by 25% or 200 pupils (whichever is the lesser), or changes to the age limit of a school are prescribed alterations which means that statutory proposals have to be published, and there must be a period of four weeks for representations before a decision is made.

7.6 The Council, before making any decision regarding the expansion of a school, must ensure that capital funding is in place, interested parties have been consulted, the statutory notice is published and there has been a four week period for representation. The consultation has taken place and the statutory notice issued within the requisite timescales. In relation to the additional funding requested to be paid by Lewisham to fund some of the works as set out at paragraph 5.14, some of these are required to comply with planning conditions and the remainder of the works are considered beneficial to the pupils and conform to Lewisham standard features in Lewisham-led development to schools. The Mayor has to consider the cost of these works against the benefits to the pupils.

7.7 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

7.8 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

7.9 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

7.10 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public
authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: 

7.11 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

7.12 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: 

7.13 In deciding whether to agree the recommendations of this report, the Mayor must be satisfied that to do so is a reasonable exercise of his discretion on a consideration of all relevant matters and disregarding irrelevancies and having regard to all Guidance that he is statutorily required to consider.

8 Crime and Disorder Implications

8.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

9 Equalities Implications

9.1 This report supports the delivery of the Council's Equalities programme by ensuring that all children whose parents /carers require a place in a Lewisham school will be able to access one.

10 Environmental Implications

10.1 Every effort will be made to enhance rather than detract from school environments in the solutions to providing additional primary place

11 Risk assessment

11.1 There are financial risks if insufficient funding is made available to support the delivery of the programme. There are also significant reputational risks to the
Council if it does not meet its statutory requirement to ensure sufficient primary school places are made available.

12 Conclusion

12.1 There is a clear need to expand primary provision to meet demand in the borough and the increased pace of regeneration proposals in this locality reinforces the value of increasing a popular and successful school such as Sir Francis Drake. The scheme arrived at after this autumn’s consultation process meets the specification for a new build 2FE school and the governing body have been able to play a full part in its development. The scheme is recommended to the Mayor.
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1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 This report seeks the Mayor’s approval for the Local Authority’s admissions arrangements for community schools, the admissions scheme for the planned and in year admissions rounds and the Published Admissions Number (PAN) for all mainstream schools for the academic year 2017/18.

2. Summary

2.1 This report sets out details of the Local Authority’s admissions arrangements for community schools for the academic year 2017/18, the admissions scheme for the planned and in year admissions rounds and the Published Admissions Number (PAN) for all mainstream schools for the academic year 2017/18. This report does not propose any significant changes to the Council’s admissions arrangements determined for 2016/17.

3. Policy Context

3.1 The School Admissions Code was revised and published in December 2014 and amends the formal consultation timetable. This requires that the admissions arrangements must be determined no later than 28 February 2016 for the policy which applies to school admissions for the 2017/18 academic year. Once determined the admissions arrangements must be published on the Council’s website no later than 15 March and any objections to the determined arrangements must be made to the Office of the School Adjudicator by 15 May in the same year.

3.2 The operation of a fair and equitable system for the admission of children to school supports Lewisham’s Corporate priority to raise educational attainment, skills levels and employability ensuring that children, particularly vulnerable groups e.g. Children in Care, have a fair, transparent and speedy admission into school.

3.3 This report contributes to the delivery of the 2015-18 Children and Young Peoples Plan (CYPP) and our vision of improving the lives and life chances of the children and young people in Lewisham and values of:
- having the highest aspirations and ambitions for all our children and young people;
- putting children and young people first every time and
- making a positive difference to the lives of children and young people.

3.4 The CYPP 2015-18 underpins Lewisham’s priority of Raising Achievement and Attainment particularly in relation to ensuring there are sufficient school places for every Lewisham child (AA1).

3.5 This report contributes to the delivery of Lewisham’s Sustainable Communities Strategy 2008-2020 and, in particular, our principle of reducing inequality. We will do this by:
- creating and maintaining schools in Lewisham that are ambitious and achieving, where children are inspired and supported to fulfil their potential and
- encouraging children and their parents to be empowered, responsible and actively involved in their local school and wider community.

4. Recommendations

The Mayor is asked to agree:

4.1 The nursery, primary, secondary and sixth form admissions arrangements for Lewisham’s community mainstream schools as set out in Appendix A to H be agreed;

4.2 The pan London Admissions Schemes for reception and secondary transfer and a local scheme for in year admissions as detailed in Appendix I.

5. Background

5.1 Education Act 2002

The Education Act 2002 required all Local Authorities (LA) to introduce co-ordinated schemes for primary admissions with effect from 2006 and secondary admissions with effect from 2005. These schemes enable parents to express a number of preferences which, although ranked by parents, are treated equally by the schools involved. This widens the scope for parents and pupils and tackles the problem of multiple offers which previously clogged the transfer system. Lewisham, like all London authorities, participates in the Pan London Admissions scheme which facilitates cross-border applications and sharing of information. Since September 2010 London boroughs have operated a Pan London scheme for both primary (reception) and secondary transfer and, for 2016 admissions, infant to junior applications too. This impacts on resources both in terms of staffing and use of the Pan London Register (the computer system used to electronically exchange applicant details and admissions decisions).

A revised School Admissions Code came into force in December 2014. The Code no longer requires the central co-ordination of in-year admissions. However Lewisham’s view with the support of the majority of mainstream headteachers is that this function should continue to be centralised. No objections to this specific proposal have been made and Lewisham will continue to co-ordinate applications to schools in the borough and will participate in a voluntary London wide scheme by exchanging application details and results of these with the applicants’ home local authority.

5.3 As is the usual practice, Lewisham LA consulted schools and governors neighbouring LAs and any other interested parties during the latter part of the autumn term 2015. For this particular round the consultation was also
5.4 The consultation included:
- The admissions policies for community schools and
- The admissions policy for community sixth forms.

6. Consultation Overview

6.1 Lewisham LA consulted schools and governors, neighbouring LAs, teaching unions, diocesan bodies and parents of children between the ages of 2 and 18 years old. This consultation included publishing a public notice in the News Shopper local newspaper on 25 November 2015.

7. Responses to the consultation

There were no responses received in relation to Lewisham’s consultation.

8. Financial implications

There are no additional financial implications to this report.

9. Legal Implications

9.1 In accordance with the provisions of section 88C of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 (as amended) (SSFA) and the School Admissions (Admission Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) admission authorities for maintained schools in England must before the beginning of each school year determine the admission arrangements that are to apply for that year.

9.2 Before determining the admission arrangements the admission authority is required to carry out consultation in accordance with the “Admission Regulations 2012” (as amended). The amended regulations determine the necessary arrangements under which pupils are to be admitted to schools in England for the academic year 2017/18. Admission authorities are also required to act in accordance with the relevant provisions of the School Admissions Code (The Code) issued in December 2014.

9.3 Admission authorities must now take all steps necessary to ensure that they have completed their consultation by the 31 January in the determination year. Admission authorities must determine their admission arrangements for entry in September 2017 by 28 February 2016.

9.4 The Code requires that oversubscription criteria must be reasonable, clear, objective, procedurally fair, and comply with all relevant legislation, including equalities legislation. Admission authorities must ensure that their arrangements will not disadvantage unfairly, either directly or indirectly, a child from a particular social or racial group, or a child with a disability or special educational needs.

9.5 Once admission arrangements have been determined the local authority is required to notify appropriate bodies and publish a copy of their determined arrangements on their web site by 15 March and displaying them for the whole offer year.
The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) brings together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act includes a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty), replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. The new duty covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
• eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
• advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
• foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

As was the case for the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) issued guidance in January 2011 providing an overview of the new public sector equality duty, including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. The guidance covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance can be found at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/adviceand-guidance/new-equality-act-guidance/equality-act-guidancedownloads/.

The EHRC guidance does not have legal standing, unlike the statutory Code of Practice on the public sector equality duty which was due to be produced by the EHRC under the Act. However, the Government has now stated that no further statutory codes under the Act will be approved. The EHRC has indicated that it will issue the draft code on the PSED as a non statutory code following further review and consultation but, like the guidance, the non statutory code will not have legal standing.

In deciding whether to agree the recommendations in this report, the Mayor must be satisfied that to do so is a reasonable exercise of his discretion on a consideration of all relevant matters and disregarding irrelevancies and having regard to the School Admissions Code which the local authority is statutorily required to comply with in the discharge of its function as an admissions authority.

Equalities implications

The purpose of the School Admissions Code is to ensure that places in maintained schools and Academies are allocated and offered in an open and fair way. Admission Authorities must ensure that criteria are fair, clear and objectives. This includes ensuring that parents are easily able to understand how places for a particular school will be allocated.

Admission authorities must act in accordance with the Code, the School Admissions Appeal Code, other laws relating to admissions and relevant human rights and equalities legislation. Authorities must also ensure that their
arrangements will not disadvantage, either directly or indirectly, a child from a particular social or racial group, or a child with a disability or special educational need’ (Code, paragraph 1.8)

10.3 Lewisham’s arrangements comply with these requirements and vigilance is embedded in our processes. Any instances of poor practice may be challenged and referred to the School Adjudicator if necessary.

11. Environmental implications

11.1 There are no direct environmental implications arising from this report.
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If you have any questions on this paper, please contact Linda Fuller, Team Leader – Admissions & Appeals, 3rd Floor, Laurence House, SE6 4RU (telephone 0208 314 6212 or email linda.fuller@lewisham.gov.uk).
Lewisham’s determined admissions criteria for nursery schools and nursery classes in community primary schools (children starting nursery during the academic year 2017/18)

Where there is over-subscription, places will be offered to:

1. A looked after child’ or a child who was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, child arrangements, or special guardianship order. A looked after child is a child who is a) in the care of a local authority, or b) being provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of their social services functions (see definition in Section 22(1) of the Children Act 1989). Details must be supplied by the allocated social worker or foster carer.

2. In exceptional circumstances there is discretion to admit vulnerable children, as determined by Lewisham’s Children Centre Criteria for Priority or Excluded (POE), on the grounds of their or their family’s severe medical or social need for that particular school and who would not otherwise qualify for admission. The application must be supported by a letter from a hospital consultant, social worker or similar professional, setting out the reasons why the nursery is the only one able to meet the child’s needs, before an admission decision is made. The admission decision will be made by the headteacher who may consult with the Executive Director for Children and Young People. Supporting documentary evidence must be provided with the application;

3. Children whose brother or sister is on the roll of the main school when the application is made and is expected to be on the roll of the school, or of the junior school in the case of separate infant and junior schools, at the intended date of admission. If the school is over-subscribed entirely with siblings, priority will be given to those
   
   i) with exceptional social or medical need (as defined in paragraph 2 above) and then to those
   
   ii) permanently living closest to the school (as defined in paragraph 4 below)

Children applying for a place at Clyde or Chelwood Nurseries will only qualify for a place under the sibling criteria if their older sibling is on the roll of the nursery when the application is made and is expected to be on the roll of the nursery at the intended date of admission.

Children in Year 6 of a mainstream primary school and who will have transferred to secondary school by the time the younger child is admitted to the nursery do not confer sibling priority.

siblings include all blood or adoptive siblings, half-siblings, foster siblings of Looked After Children and step siblings. Siblings must all live at the same address as the child applying. Proof of the sibling relationship may be required.
4 Children whose permanent home address is closest to the school.

All distances will be measured in a straight line, using digitised mapping software of the area, from the home to the nearest gate nominated by the school. If more than one applicant lives in multi-occupancy building (e.g. flats) priority will be given to the applicant whose door number is the lowest numerically and/or alphabetically.

Waiting lists will be held in the same order as the admission criteria.

**Tie break** - on the rare occasion where two or more children tie for the last available place, lots will be drawn to decide which child is offered the place.

To meet the needs of the age group Head teachers will have discretion over the balance of eligible* two year olds, and three- and four-year olds in their nurseries, and the ratio of part-time and any full-time places offered.

Priority will be given to Lewisham residents.

An existing childminder’s address, instead of the permanent address, may only be used to determine “nearness” if the child has an exceptional medical or social need for that particular school. The permanent home address must also be in Lewisham.

Three terms is regarded as the minimum time that children should spend in a nursery school or nursery class before transferring to a reception class.

Applications to nursery schools or classes are not dealt with through a co-ordinated scheme and there is no set closing or decision date. Applications are made direct to the nursery.

If a child cannot be offered a place, a request can be made for the child’s name to be placed on the waiting list; however there is no formal appeal process.

- *please refer to the Early Education and Childcare Guidance 2014 for further information about eligibility.*
Lewisham’s determined admissions criteria for community primary school reception classes (children born between 1 September 2012 and 31 August 2013) and who will start school in September 2017

When there is over-subscription, places are offered to:

1 A looked after child’ or a child who was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, child arrangements, or special guardianship order. A looked after child is a child who is a) in the care of a local authority, or b) being provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of their social services functions (see definition in Section 22(1) of the Children Act 1989). Details must be supplied by the allocated social worker or foster carer.

2 In exceptional circumstances there is discretion to admit children on the grounds of their or their family’s severe medical or social need for that particular school and who would not otherwise qualify for admission. The application must be supported by a letter from a hospital consultant, social worker or similar professional, setting out the reasons why the school is the only one to meet the child’s needs, before an admission decision is made. The admission decision will be considered in consultation with a panel of teaching and medical professionals. Medical professionals provide advice on applications made under medical conditions and teaching professionals advise on applications made for social or special reasons. Supporting evidence must be provided before the closing date for applications.

3 Children whose brother or sister is on roll of the school on the closing date for applications and is expected to be on the roll of the school (or of the junior school in the case of separate infant and junior schools*), at the intended date of admission. Children in Year 6 who will have transferred to secondary school by the time the younger child is admitted do not confer sibling priority. If the school is over-subscribed entirely with siblings, priority will be given to:
   i) those with an exceptional social or medical need (see 2 above) and then to
   ii) those who are permanently living nearest to the school (see 4 below).

* this applies to children attending Sandhurst Infant and Junior Schools, Stillness Infant and Junior Schools and Torridon Infant and Junior Schools.

Siblings include all blood or adoptive siblings, half-siblings, foster siblings of Looked After Children and step siblings. Siblings must all live at the same address as the child applying. Proof of the sibling relationship may be required.
4  Children living nearest to the school.

All distances will be measured to a central nodal point in the school premises, using digitised mapping software of the area, from a nodal point in the applicant’s permanent home address. If more than one applicant lives in a multi-occupancy building (e.g. flats) priority will be given to the applicant whose door number is the lowest numerically and/or alphabetically.

**Twins, triplets and other multiple births**—where twins, triplets or children from other multiple births qualify for the last school place to be allocated Lewisham will admit all of the qualifying siblings in excess of the published admissions limit and they will be considered as ‘excepted pupils’.

**Tie break** - on the rare occasion where two or more identical applications qualify for the last available place, lots will be drawn to decide which qualifying child is offered the place.

**Waiting lists** - In accordance with the pan London agreement, and to ensure Lewisham meets its duty to continue to co-ordinate admissions beyond offer date and comply with the parents’ highest possible preference, Lewisham will ensure that waiting lists do not contain lower ranked preferences except where it (or the home LA) has agreed to a parental request to change the order of preferences. In such cases, where there is a parental request to change the order of preferences, the original application, including any offer made under co-ordination, will be withdrawn and the applicant will be required to re-apply. Waiting lists for Lewisham’s community schools will include those who have moved to the area and were unable to make an ‘ontime’ application.

The reception co-ordinated scheme continues until the end of the summer term 2017. Applications received for reception class beyond the end of the summer term 2017 will be considered as an In Year applicant. Waiting lists will be held for the first term of the reception year only. Those with a continuing interest in a place at a school beyond this time will be required to make an in year application.
Lewisham’s determined admissions criteria for community secondary schools for pupils transferring from primary to secondary school in September 2017 (children born between 1 September 2005 and 31 August 2006)

Where there is oversubscription places will be offered to:

1. A looked after child’ or a child who was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, child arrangements, or special guardianship order. A looked after child is a child who is a) in the care of a local authority, or b) being provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of their social services functions (see definition in Section 22(1) of the Children Act 1989). Details must be supplied by the allocated social worker or foster carer.

2. In exceptional circumstances there is discretion to admit children on the grounds of their or their family’s severe medical or social need for that particular school and who would not otherwise qualify for admission. The application must be supported by a letter from a hospital consultant, social worker or similar professional, setting out the reasons why the school is the only one to meet the child’s needs before an admission decision is made. The admission decision will be considered in consultation with a panel of teaching and medical professionals. Medical professionals provide advice on applications made under medical conditions and teaching professionals advise on applications made for social or special reasons. Supporting evidence must be provided before the closing date for applications.

3a. 11 – 16 Community Schools - Children whose older brother or sister is on roll of the school on the closing date for applications as well as those whose sibling was a former pupil of the school and who transferred to a 16-18 education provision at the end of the previous academic year. If the school is over-subscribed entirely with siblings, priority will be given (i) to those with exceptional social and medical need and (ii) to those living nearest the school. Or

3b. 11-18 Community Schools - Children whose brother or sister is on roll of the school on the closing date for applications and will still be on the roll of the school at the intended date of admission. If the school is over-subscribed entirely with siblings, priority will be given (i) to those with exceptional social and medical need and (ii) to those living nearest the school.

In all cases siblings include all blood and adoptive siblings, half-siblings, foster siblings of Looked After Children and step siblings. Siblings must
all live at the same address as the child. Proof of the sibling relationship may be required.

4 Children who live nearest to the school.

All distances will be measured to a central nodal point in the school premises, using digitised mapping software of the area, from a nodal point in the applicant’s permanent home address. If more than one applicant lives in a multi-occupancy building (e.g. flats) priority will be given to the applicant whose door number is the lowest numerically and/or alphabetically.

Twins, triplets and other multiple births– where twins, triplets or children from other multiple births qualify for the last school place to be allocated Lewisham will admit all of the qualifying siblings in excess of the published admissions limit.

Tie break - on the rare occasion where two or more identical applications qualify for the last available place lots will be drawn to decide which qualifying child is offered the place.

When a school is over-subscribed, any vacancy which arises as a result of the withdrawal of a successful application will be offered to the next child on the waiting list

Waiting lists - In accordance with the pan London agreement, and to ensure Lewisham meets its duty to continue to co-ordinate admissions beyond offer date and comply with the parents' highest possible preference, Lewisham will ensure that waiting lists do not contain lower ranked preferences except where it (or the home LA) has agreed to a parental request to change the order of preferences. In such cases, where there is a parental request to change the order of preferences, the original application, including any offer made under co-ordination, will be withdrawn and the applicant will be required to re-apply. Secondary Transfer - waiting lists for Lewisham's community schools will include those who have moved to the area and were unable to make an 'ontime' application.

The pan London secondary transfer scheme continues until the end of the summer term 2017. Applications received for Year 7 beyond the end of the summer term 2017 will be considered as In Year applications.

Waiting lists will be held for the first term of the Year 7 only. Those with a continuing interest in a place at a school beyond this time will be required to make an in year application.
Lewisham’s determined admissions arrangements for community school’s sixth form

In the event of the school’s sixth form being over-subscribed (having more applications than places available) places will be offered to the following:

1 A looked after child’ or a child who was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, child arrangements, or special guardianship order. A looked after child is a child who is a) in the care of a local authority, or b)being provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of their social services functions (see definition in Section 22(1) of the Children Act 1989). Details must be supplied by the allocated social worker or foster carer.

2 Applicants who have an exceptional social or medical need for a place at the school, supported by professional documentation from a hospital consultant, social worker or similar. Decisions on these cases will be taken in consultation with the Executive Director for Children and Young People or her delegated representative.

3 Lewisham students who apply to Christ The King Sixth Form College will be guaranteed an interview at either of the Lewisham sites.

4 Applicants who at the time of application are on roll of Forest Hill or Sydenham schools will be given priority at Sydenham and Forest Hill Sixth Form (SFH6).

5 Applicants who can best demonstrate their suitability for the course involved (factors taken into account will be attendance and previous academic performance).

6 If the school is over-subscribed with applicants from the feeder schools only, priority will first go to applicants from those schools with professionally-supported social or medical cases (see above), and then to those who can best demonstrate their suitability for the course involved.

7 If two identical applicants qualify for the last available place, home to school distance will be used as a tie break. If the applicants live the exact distance from the school lots will be taken to determine which applicant is offered the remaining place.

Any minimum standards required for entry will be published in the school’s prospectus.
Lewisham is required to publish the number of places (if any) expected to be available to students not on roll of the feeder schools. For SFH6 it is expected that a maximum of 10 places per school (20 in total) will be available to children attending other schools.

There will be the right of appeal against any refusal of a place at the school's sixth form, and the appeal will be heard in line with the provisions of the Education Act 2002.

The sixth forms will publish a closing date for receipt of applications and the date of notification of the outcome of their applications. Late applicants will only be considered if there are places unallocated at the time of application.
APPENDIX E

Lewisham’s determined arrangements for In Year Admissions to Lewisham community schools

Applications for places at a maintained school, including faith, foundation and free schools and Academies in Lewisham community primary or secondary schools in a year group other than the normal year of entry to primary (Class R to Year 6) and secondary school (Year 7 to Year 11), will be treated as an In Year admission. Applications should be made on a Lewisham In Year Admission Common Application Form (iCAF) and returned direct to the School Admissions and Appeals Team 3rd Floor Laurence House SE6 4RU.

From the autumn term of the admission year places for all year groups to a Lewisham community primary or secondary school will be offered to children in the following order:

a) A looked after child’ or a child who was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, child arrangements, or special guardianship order. A looked after child is a) in the care of a local authority, or b) being provided with accommodation by a local authority in the exercise of their social services functions (see definition in Section 22(1) of the Children Act 1989). Details must be supplied by the allocated social worker or foster carer.

b) Children with severe social and medical need for that particular school and who would not otherwise qualify for admission. The application must be supported by a letter from a hospital consultant, social worker or similar professional setting out the reasons why the school is the only one to meet the child’s needs.

c) Siblings of children already on the roll of the school.

d) Children who live nearest the school, the distance being measured in a straight line using digitized mapping software to a central nodal point in the school premises.

Children who are newly arrived in the borough and do not have a school place and have not been offered an alternative school place within a reasonable distance from the family home (ie 2 miles for children in Key Stage 1 and 3 miles for children in Key Stages 2, 3 and 4) will be placed under Lewisham’s Fair Access protocol and may take priority for a school placement.
Generic protocols for admitting children under the In Year Admissions Arrangements

- Parents wishing to make an In Year application to any maintained school including faith, foundation and free schools and Academies in Lewisham should do so by completing a Lewisham iCAF. Community schools will not hold separate waiting lists and are required to inform Lewisham of their current vacancies.

- As the co-ordinating authority for in year admissions across both primary and secondary phases Lewisham LA will decide which school or federation of schools to approach about an individual admission. In most cases this will be at one of the schools named by the parent on their iCAF. Where it is not possible to offer a Lewisham resident a place at the school named and where the child is not on roll of a local primary school Lewisham will offer the next nearest school to the family home with a vacancy. The parent will also be notified of their statutory right of appeal if the preferred school(s) is (are) full.

- Where the application is for a community school Lewisham will inform the parent of the school to be offered and will determine the date the child will be added to the school’s roll. In turn schools must arrange the admission by the date specified in the offer letter.

- Where an application is made for a voluntary aided, foundation or free school or an Academy Lewisham will refer the applicant’s details to the school who will be required to confirm within 10 school days whether a place can be offered or not. Once a decision has been taken the school will inform Lewisham’s Admissions and Appeals Team of the outcome and, where a place can be offered, the Team will contact the applicant direct to inform them of this. The Admissions Authority must inform unsuccessful applicants of their right of appeal.

- Schools must place the child on roll by the date determined by the School Admissions and Appeals Team.

- Children transferring from one local school to another may not transfer to the new school until the start of the following half term unless both the home school and receiving school agrees.

- Federations will have an important role in apportioning admissions among the schools in their federation.

- If an admission is disputed by a school, the case must be referred to the Fair Access Panel completing the appropriate referral form giving detailed reasons why the school should not admit the child within 7 school days. The child’s placement will be discussed at the next Fair Access Panel. Lewisham reserves the right to direct admission if necessary.

- Details will be shared with schools termly about the numbers of admissions taking place. There should not be a disproportionate impact on any school.
Transfers between schools

Children who request a transfer from their current school do not take priority over those who qualify under the Fair Access or In Year Admissions arrangements as detailed above. Applicants will be referred to their home school and the parent asked to discuss their reasons for transfer with the Headteacher. Children who are requesting a transfer due to their challenging behaviour may require a managed move. Please refer to the Managed Moves Policy.
Generic admissions arrangements

Lewisham LA will continue to participate in the pan London admissions scheme (known as The Scheme) for reception and secondary transfer admissions. Please refer to the scheme for details of how this operates.

Reception

Timing of Admission – Lewisham will operate one point of entry for reception class. Children born between 1 September 2012 and 31 August 2013 will be expected to accept a full time reception place starting in September 2017.

Parents of children who permanently live in Lewisham must apply for a reception class place (Year R) by participating in the coordinated reception scheme by making an online application.

The application period for the reception co–ordinated scheme will commence on 1 September 2016 and close on 15 January 2017.

Deferred admission to primary school - Lewisham offers early admission in reception class to children before they reach statutory school age. Parents/carers have the option of deferring their child’s admission to reception class to a later term eg the start of the spring or summer term. However the child must be admitted to school during the reception year and not beyond it. Alternatively the parent may arrange for their child to be admitted on a part time basis up to the point they reach statutory school age. Parents may not defer their child’s admission beyond reception year or after the beginning of the term after their child’s fifth birthday.

Children who attend a nursery class in a primary school frequently transfer to the main school; however there is no automatic transfer and children attending the nursery are not given priority. Parents of nursery children who permanently live in Lewisham must apply for a reception place by participating in the coordinated reception scheme either by making an online application or by completing Lewisham’s Common Application Form. Applications from parents of children on the roll of the nursery will be considered with other applicants at the appropriate time.

Secondary Transfer

Children born between 1 September 2005 and 31 August 2006 will be expected to transfer to secondary school in September 2017.

Parents of children who permanently live in Lewisham must apply for a secondary school place (Year 7) by participating in the coordinated secondary transfer scheme by making an online application.
The application period for the secondary transfer co-ordinated scheme will commence on 1 September 2016 and close on 31 October 2016.

**Earlier Admission:** In very exceptional circumstances Lewisham will consider a request for admission out of cohort for a younger child (ie for reception children this will be those born after 31 August 2013 and for Year 7 those born after 31 August 2006).

- The application may be supported by the child’s nursery/primary headteacher and/or an educational psychologist confirming that the child is academically outstanding and sufficiently physically and emotionally mature to cope with the demands of primary/secondary school
- The parent agrees that their child will transfer to primary/secondary school with the earlier cohort regardless of the outcome of their applications and will not qualify to participate in the transfer scheme the following year.

**Later admission:** In very exceptional circumstances Lewisham will consider a request for a delayed admission for an older child (ie for reception this will be those born before 1 September 2012 and for Year 7 those born before 1 September 2004).

- The application may be supported by the child’s nursery/primary headteacher and/or an educational psychologist confirming that the child has learning delay or difficulty and their social maturity is well below that of his or her peers.
- The parent agrees that their child will transfer to primary/secondary school with the later cohort regardless of the outcome of their applications and had not participated in the transfer scheme the year before.

In cases described above parents must consider the implications of an earlier or later transfer as headteachers of primary/secondary schools are not required to continue to keep the child out of year group and may decide to later educate the child in the correct year*.

*Further guidance on the admission of summer born children is expected and Lewisham will amend its current arrangements on ‘out of cohort’ admissions where necessary.

The Education and Skills Act 2008 increased the minimum age at which young people in England can leave learning which requires them to continue in education or training to the age of 18. Children who have transferred to secondary school a year earlier than their peers will be required to stay in full-time education, undertake work-based learning such as an Apprenticeship, or part-time education or training if they are employed, self-employed or volunteering for more than 20 hours per week until they are 18.
Secondary school visits: Each Lewisham secondary school will be open on set
days early in the autumn term to enable parents to visit and discuss the
educational opportunities available. A list of visit dates and arrangements will
appear on Lewisham’s website.

Parents of pupils attending Lewisham primary schools will have the opportunity
to meet their primary head teacher to discuss their preference of schools.
Appointments will be made for parents who need assistance in completing their
Common Application Form. The on line application must be made by the
notified closing date.

Making an Application –Primary and Secondary

All applicants will be required to demonstrate that the address they are
applying from is their permanent home address and that they have parental
responsibility and therefore eligible to apply for a school place for the child.
Applications from children who are transferring to reception class or secondary
school and not already on the roll of a Lewisham primary school and whose
documentation has not been previously verified must be accompanied by:

i. the applicants current Council Tax bill to establish permanent home
address and

ii the child benefit letter or child tax credit letter to establish that the
applicant has parental responsibility.

Parents may state the reasons why they wish their child to attend a particular
school, including whether there is a sibling already attending the school.

Shared care arrangements: Lewisham is aware that some parents share the
care of their child. Lewisham will normally accept that the child lives with the
parent who has parental responsibility and who is in receipt of child benefit and
child tax credit. Documentary evidence for example a residence order or other
court order may be required.

Permanent home address: Proof of permanent home address will be required
and will include the current Council Tax statement, In addition Lewisham may
require copies of utility bills.

Lewisham is aware that some parents rent a property close to a popular school
to increase the likelihood of their child gaining admission. To establish an
applicant’s permanent rather than temporary home address the following will
be required;

1 closing accounts for the last known address,
2 official confirmation of the end of tenancy or house sale for the
last known address,
3a a tenancy agreement via a commercial letting agency for a period
of 12 months or more. The period of the tenancy must extend beyond
the start of the academic year in which the child is due to be admitted or
3b solicitors’ confirmation of the completion of the purchase of the
new property
Where the tenancy or ownership of the last known address has not been surrendered, Lewisham will accept this last known address as the permanent home address.

In establishing permanent home address Lewisham may also check records held within the Council as well as other external agencies. If a false address has been given and an offer made on the basis of that information, the offer of a place may be withdrawn.

**Appeals:** Appeals for statutory school phases will be heard in accordance with the provisions of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and the Education Act 2002, together with the School Admissions Appeals Code. Parents will have the right of appeal to any school that has refused their child a place. Appeals for reception and secondary transfer phases for community schools will be heard during the summer term prior to the child’s admission to school.

Parents who have appealed unsuccessfully for a school will not be able to apply and subsequently appeal again for a place at the same school in the same academic year unless there are significant and material changes to the child or family’s circumstances. Documentary proof of such changes will be required from the appropriate professional(s) working with the family.
### DETERMINED ADMISSIONS LIMITS 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>Admissions Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adamsrill</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashmead</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athelney</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baring</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beecroft Gardens</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindishe Green</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindishe Lee</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindishe Manor</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childeric</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers Lane</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmain</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Park</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downderry</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Waller</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfrida</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot Bank</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairlawn</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster Park</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordonbrock</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinling Gibbons</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashers’ Aske’s Temple</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Free School</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haseltine</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbeach</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horniman</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ball</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stainer</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Grove</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kender</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>Admissions Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmorie</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launcelot</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Vale</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvels Lane</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myatt Garden</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady &amp; St Philip Neri</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrymount</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangefield</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathfern</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushey Green</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhurst Junior</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhurst Infant</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Francis Drake</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustine’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bartholomew’s</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Hatcham</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John the Baptist</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margaret’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary Magdalen</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviour’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen’s</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St William of York</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Winifred’s Primary School</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillness Junior</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillness Infant</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidemill Academy</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torridon Junior</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torridon Infant</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnham</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>Admissions Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addey and Stanhope</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus Pastor</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conisborough College</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Green</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast Hilly Fields College</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgehill</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All-age Schools**

The published admissions number for all-age schools is set for the reception intake. Admissions to Year 7 for new applicants will depend on the number of children automatically transferring from the Academy’s Primary Phase in Year 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reception</th>
<th>Total Year 7 admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashers’ Aske’s Hatcham College</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashers’ Aske’s Knights Academy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast Ladywell Fields College</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prendergast Vale College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthew Academy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Definitions used in the template schemes

“the Application Year” the academic year in which the parent makes an application (i.e. in relation to the academic year of entry, the academic year preceding it).

“the Board” the Pan-London Admissions Executive Board, which is responsible for the Scheme

“the Business User Guide (BUG)” the document issued annually to participating LAs setting out the operational procedures of the Scheme

“the Common Application Form” this is the form that each authority must have under the Regulations for parents to use to express their preferences, set out in rank order

“the Equal Preference System” the model whereby all preferences listed by parents on the Common Application Form are considered under the over-subscription criteria for each school without reference to parental rankings. Where a pupil is eligible to be offered a place at more than one school within an LA, or across more than one participating LA, the rankings are used to determine the single offer by selecting the school ranked highest of those which can offer a place

“the Highly Recommended Elements” the elements of the Template Scheme that are not mandatory but to which subscription is strongly recommended in order to maximise co-ordination and thereby simplify the application process as far as possible

“the Home LA” the LA in which the applicant/parent/carer is resident

“the LIAAG Address Verification Register” - the document containing the address verification policy of each participating LA

“the Local Admission System (LAS)” the IT module for administering admissions in each LA and for determining the highest offer both within and between participating LAs

“the London E-Admissions Portal” the common online application system used by the 33 London LAs and Surrey County Council

“the Maintaining LA” the LA which maintains a school, or those within whose area an academy is situated, for which a preference has been expressed.
“the Mandatory Elements” those elements of the Template Scheme to which authorities must subscribe in order to be considered as ‘Participating Authorities’ and to benefit from use of the Pan-London Register.

“the Notification Letter” the agreed form of letter sent to applicants on the Prescribed Day which communicates any determination granting or refusing admission to a primary or secondary school, which is attached as Schedule 2.

“the Prescribed Day” the day on which outcome letters are posted to parents/carers. 1 March (secondary) and 16 April (primary) in the year following the relevant determination year except that, in any year in which that day is not a working day, the prescribed day shall be the next working day.

“the Pan-London Register (PLR)” the database which will sort and transmit application and outcome data between the LAS of each participating LA.

“the Pan-London Timetable” the framework for processing of application and outcome data, which is attached as Schedule 3.

“the Participating LA” any LA that has indicated in the Memorandum of Agreement that they are willing to incorporate, at a minimum, the mandatory elements of the Template LA Scheme presented here.

“the Qualifying Scheme” the scheme which each LA is required to formulate in accordance with The School Admissions (Admissions Arrangements and Co-ordination of Admission Arrangements) Regulations 2012, for co-ordinating arrangements for the admission of children to maintained primary and secondary schools and academies.
Template Scheme for Co-ordination of Admissions to Year 7 in 2017/18

Applications

1. Lewisham LA will advise home LAs of their resident pupils on the roll of its maintained primary schools and academies who are eligible to transfer to secondary school in the forthcoming academic year.

2. Applications from Lewisham residents will be made on its Common Application Form, which will be available and able to be submitted on-line. This will include all the fields and information specified in Schedule 1 to this Template LA Scheme. These will be supplemented by any additional fields and information which are deemed necessary by Lewisham LA to enable the admission authorities in the area to apply their published oversubscription criteria.

3. Lewisham LA will take all reasonable steps to ensure that every parent/carer who is resident in the borough and has a child in their last year of primary education within a maintained school, either in Lewisham or any other maintaining LA, accesses an online version of Lewisham’s admissions booklet, including details of how to apply online. The admissions booklet will also be available to parents/carers who do not live in Lewisham, and will include information on how they can access their home LA’s Common Application Form.

4. The admission authorities within Lewisham will not use supplementary information forms except where the information available through the Common Application Form is insufficient for consideration of the application against the published oversubscription criteria. Where supplementary information forms are used by the admissions authorities within Lewisham, the LA will seek to ensure that these only collect information which is required by the published oversubscription criteria, in accordance with paragraph 2.4 of the School Admissions Code 2014.

5. Where supplementary information forms are used by admission authorities in Lewisham LA, they will be available via their website. Such forms will advise parents that they must also complete their home LA’s Common Application Form. Lewisham LA’s information on the transfer process, available on Lewisham’s website, will indicate which schools in the borough require supplementary forms to be completed and where they can be obtained.

6. Where an admission authority in Lewisham receives a supplementary information form, Lewisham LA will not consider it to be a valid application unless the parent/carer has also listed the school on their home LA’s Common Application Form, in accordance with paragraph 2.3 of the School Admissions Code 2014.

7. Applicants will be able to express a preference for six maintained secondary schools or Academies within and/or outside the borough.

8. The order of preference given on the Common Application Form will not be revealed to a school within Lewisham LA. This is to comply with paragraph 1.9 of the School Admissions Code 2014 which states that admission authorities must not give extra priority to children whose parents rank preferred schools in a particular order, including ‘first preference first’
arrangements. However, where a parent resident in Lewisham LA expresses a preference for schools in the area of another LA, the order of preference for that LA’s schools will be revealed to that LA in order that it can determine the highest ranked preference in cases where an applicant is eligible for a place at more than one school in that LA’s area.

9. Lewisham LA undertakes to carry out the address verification process as set out in its entry in LIAAG Address Verification Register. This will in all cases include validation of resident applicants against Lewisham LA’s primary school data and the further investigation of any discrepancy. Where Lewisham LA is not satisfied as to the validity of an address of an applicant whose preference has been sent to a maintaining LA, it will advise the maintaining LA no later than 12 December 2016.

10. Lewisham LA will confirm the status of any resident child for whom it receives a Common Application Form stating s/he is a ‘Child Looked After’ and will provide evidence to the maintaining LA in respect of a preference for a school in its area by 11 November 2016.

11. Lewisham LA will advise a maintaining LA of the reason for any preference expressed for a school in its area, in respect of a resident child born outside of the correct age cohort, and will forward any supporting documentation to the maintaining LA by 11 November 2016.

Processing

12. Applicants resident within Lewisham LA must return the Common Application Form, which will be available and able to be submitted on-line, to this LA by 31 October 2016. However, Lewisham LA will publish information which encourages applicants to submit their application by 21 October 2016 (i.e. the Friday before half term), to allow it sufficient time to process and check all applications before the mandatory date when data must be sent to the PLR. Applications cannot be amended once they have been submitted on the closing date.

13. Application data relating to all preferences for schools in the area of a participating LA, which have been expressed within the terms of Lewisham’s scheme will be up-loaded to the PLR by 11 November 2016. Supplementary information provided with the Common Application Form will be sent to maintaining LAs by the same date.

14. Lewisham LA shall, in consultation with the admission authorities within its area and within the framework of the Pan-London timetable in Schedule 3A, determine and state its own timetable for the processing of preference data and the application of published oversubscription criteria.

15. Lewisham LA will accept late applications only if they are late for a good reason, deciding each case on its own merits.

16. Where such applications contain preferences for schools in other LAs, Lewisham LA will forward the details to maintaining LAs via the PLR as they are received. Lewisham LA will accept late applications which are considered to be on time within the terms of the home LA’s scheme.
17. The latest date for the upload to the PLR of late applications which are considered to be on-time within the terms of Lewisham LA’s scheme is 12 December 2016.

18. Where an applicant moves from one participating home LA to Lewisham after submitting an on-time application under the terms of the former home LA’s scheme, Lewisham LA will accept the application as on-time up to 9 December 2016, on the basis that an on-time application already exists within the Pan-London system.

19. Lewisham LA will participate in the application data checking exercise scheduled between 13 December 2016 and 3 January 2017 in the Pan-London timetable in Schedule 3A.

20. All preferences for schools within Lewisham LA will be considered by the relevant admission authorities without reference to rank order in accordance with paragraphs 1.9 of the School Admissions Code 2014. When the admission authorities within Lewisham LA have provided a list of applicants in criteria order to Lewisham, this LA shall, for each applicant to its schools for whom more than one potential offer is available, use the highest ranked preference to decide which single potential offer to make. This is the ‘Equal Preference System’.

21. Lewisham LA will carry out all reasonable checks to ensure that pupil rankings are correctly held in its LAS before uploading data to the PLR.

22. Lewisham LA will upload the highest potential offer available to an applicant for a maintained school or academy in this LA to the PLR by 3 February 2017. The PLR will transmit the highest potential offer specified by the Maintaining LA to the Home LA.

23. Lewisham’s LAS will eliminate, as a Home LA, all but the highest ranked offer where an applicant has more than one potential offer across Maintaining LAs submitting information within deadline to the PLR. This will involve exchanges of preference outcomes between the LAS and the PLR (in accordance with the iterative timetable published in the Business User Guide) which will continue until notification that a steady state has been achieved, or until 16 February 2017 if this is sooner.

24. Lewisham LA will not make an additional offer between the end of the iterative process and 1 March 2017 which may impact on an offer being made by another participating LA.

25. Notwithstanding paragraph 24, if an error is identified within the allocation of places at a school in Lewisham, this LA will attempt to manually resolve the allocation to correct the error. Where this impacts on another LA (either as a home or maintaining LA) Lewisham LA will liaise with that LA to attempt to resolve the correct offer and any multiple offers which might occur. However, if another LA is unable to resolve a multiple offer, or if the impact is too far reaching, Lewisham LA will accept that the applicant(s) affected might receive a multiple offer.

26. Lewisham LA will participate in the offer data checking exercise scheduled between 17 and 23 February 2017 in the Pan-London timetable in Schedule 3A.
27. Lewisham LA will send a file to the E-Admissions portal with outcomes for all resident applicants who have applied online no later than 24 February 2017.

Offers

28. Lewisham LA will ensure, so far as is reasonably practical, that each resident applicant who cannot be offered a preference expressed on the Common Application Form, receives the offer of an alternative school place. Usually this will be the closest school to the applicant’s home address which has a vacancy after the allocation of school places.

29. Lewisham LA will inform all resident applicants of their highest offer of a school place and, where relevant, the reasons why higher preferences were not offered, whether they were for schools in Lewisham or in other participating LAs.

30. Lewisham LA's outcome letter will include the information set out in Schedule 2.

31. On 1 March 2017, Lewisham LA will send by first class post notification of the outcome to resident applicants who made a paper application.

32. Lewisham LA will provide its primary schools with destination data of its resident applicants via the School Admissions Module (SAM) which will be available from 2 March 2017.

Post Offer

33. Lewisham LA will request that resident applicants accept or decline the offer of a place by 15 March 2017, or within two weeks of the date of any subsequent offer.

34. Where an applicant resident in Lewisham LA accepts or declines a place in a school maintained by another LA by 15 March 2017, Lewisham LA will forward the information to the maintaining LA by 22 March 2017. Where such information is received from applicants after 15 March, Lewisham LA will pass it to the maintaining LA as it is received.

35. Where a place becomes available in an oversubscribed maintained school or academy in Lewisham’s area, it will be offered from a waiting list ordered in accordance with paragraph 2.14 of the School Admissions Code 2014.

36. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA will inform the home LA, where different, of an offer for a maintained school or Academy in this LA's area which can be made to an applicant resident in the home LA's area, in order that the home LA can offer the place.

37. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA and the admission authorities within it, will not inform an applicant resident in another LA that a place can be offered.

38. When acting as a home LA, Lewisham LA will offer a place at a maintained school or Academy in the area of another LA to an applicant resident in its area, provided that the school is ranked higher on the Common Application Form than any school already offered.
39. When acting as a home LA, when Lewisham LA is informed by a maintaining LA of an offer which can be made to an applicant resident in this LA’s area which is ranked lower on the Common Application Form than any school already offered, it will inform the maintaining LA that the offer will not be made.

40. When acting as a home LA, when Lewisham LA has agreed to a change of preference order for good reason, it will inform any maintaining LA affected by the change. In such cases, paragraphs 37 and 38 shall apply to the revised order of preferences.

41. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA will inform the home LA, where different, of any change to an applicant’s offer status as soon as it occurs.

42. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA will accept new applications from home LAs for maintained schools and academies in its area.

43. Waiting lists - Requests to be placed on a waiting list for a school within Lewisham must be made via the home LA. In accordance with the pan London agreement, and to ensure Lewisham meets its duty to continue to co-ordinate admissions beyond offer date and comply with the parents’ highest possible preference, Lewisham will ensure that waiting lists do not contain lower ranked preferences except where it (or the home LA) has agreed to a parental request to change the order of preferences. In such cases, where there is a parental request to change the order of preferences, the original application, including any offer made under co-ordination, will be withdrawn and the applicant will be required to re-apply as an In Year applicant from September 2017.

The pan London secondary transfer scheme continues until the end of July 2017. Applications received for Year 7 from 1 August 2017 will be considered as In Year applications.

Waiting lists for community schools in Lewisham will be held for the first term of the academic year (Year 7) of admission only. Those wishing to be considered for a place beyond the first term of Year 7 will be required to make an in year application.

Secondary Transfer waiting lists for Lewisham’s community schools will include those who have moved to the area and were unable to make an ‘ontime’ application. Parental enquiries about waiting list positions or appeal procedures for community schools should be made to Lewisham’s Admissions Team.
Template LA Scheme for Co-ordination of Admissions to Reception/Junior in 2017/18

Applications

1. Applications from residents of Lewisham LA will be made on Lewisham LA’s Common Application Form, which will be available and able to be submitted online. This will include all the fields and information specified in Schedule 1 to this Template LA Scheme. These will be supplemented by any additional fields and information which are deemed necessary by Lewisham LA to enable the admission authorities in Lewisham to apply their published oversubscription criteria.

2. Lewisham LA will take all reasonable steps to ensure that every parent/carer who is resident in Lewisham and has a child in a nursery class within a maintained school, either in this LA or any other maintaining LA, is able to access a copy of an online version of Lewisham’s starting school booklet, including details of how to apply online. The starting school booklet will also be available to parents/carers who do not live in Lewisham, and will include information on how they can access their home LA’s Common Application Form.

3. The admission authorities within Lewisham will not use supplementary information forms except where the information available through the Common Application Form is insufficient for consideration of the application against the published oversubscription criteria. Where supplementary information forms are used by the admissions authorities within Lewisham, the LA will seek to ensure that these only collect information which is required by the published oversubscription criteria, in accordance with paragraph 2.4 of the School Admissions Code 2014.

4. Where supplementary information forms are used by admission authorities in Lewisham, they will be available on their website. Such forms will advise parents that they must also complete their home LA’s Common Application Form. Lewisham’s starting school booklet and website will indicate which schools in Lewisham require supplementary forms to be completed and where they can be obtained.

5. Where a school in Lewisham LA receives a supplementary information form, Lewisham will not consider it to be a valid application unless the parent/carer has also listed the school on their home LA’s Common Application Form, in accordance with paragraph 2.3 of the School Admissions Code 2014.

6. Applicants will be able to express a preference for up to six maintained primary schools or academies within and/or outside the Home LA.

7. The order of preference given on the Common Application Form will not be revealed to a school within Lewisham in accordance with paragraph 1.9 of the School Admissions Code 2014. However, where a parent resident in Lewisham LA expresses a preference for schools in the area of another LA, the order of preference for that LA’s schools will be revealed to that LA in order that it can determine the highest ranked preference in cases where an applicant is eligible for a place at more than one school in that LA’s area.
8. Lewisham LA undertakes to carry out the address verification process set out in its entry in the LIAAG Address Verification Register. This will include validation of resident applicants against Lewisham LA’s maintained nursery and primary school data and the further investigation of any discrepancy. Where Lewisham LA is not satisfied as to the validity of an address of an applicant whose preference has been sent to a maintaining LA, it will advise the maintaining LA no later than 17 February 2017.

9. Lewisham LA will confirm the status of any resident child for whom it receives a Common Application Form stating s/he is a ‘Child Looked After’ and will provide evidence to the maintaining LA in respect of a preference for a school in its area by 3 February 2017.

10. Lewisham LA will advise a maintaining LA of the reason for any preference expressed for a school in its area, in respect of a resident child born outside of the correct age cohort, and will forward any supporting documentation to the maintaining LA by 3 February 2017.

Processing

11. Applicants resident within Lewisham LA must return the Common Application Form, which will be available and able to be submitted on-line, to Lewisham LA by 15 January 2017.

12. Application data relating to all preferences for schools in the area of a participating LA, which have been expressed within the terms of Lewisham’s scheme, will be up-loaded to the PLR by 6 February 2017. Supplementary information provided with the Common Application Form will be sent to maintaining LAs by the same date.

13. Lewisham LA shall, in consultation with the admission authorities within this LA’s area and within the framework of the Pan-London timetable in Schedule 3B, determine its own timetable for the processing of preference data and the application of published oversubscription criteria.

14. Lewisham LA will accept late applications only if they are late for a good reason, deciding each case on its own merits.

15. Where such applications contain preferences for schools in other LAs, Lewisham LA will forward the details to maintaining LAs via the PLR as they are received. Lewisham LA will accept late applications which are considered to be on time within the terms of the home LA’s scheme.

16. The latest date for the upload to the PLR of late applications which are considered to be on-time within the terms of Lewisham's scheme is 10 February 2017.

17. Where an applicant moves from one participating home LA to Lewisham LA after submitting an on-time application under the terms of the former home LA's scheme, Lewisham LA will accept the application as on-time up to 9 February 2017, on the basis that an on-time application already exists within the Pan-London system.

18. Lewisham LA will participate in the application data checking exercise scheduled between 17 February and 23 February 2017 in the Pan-London timetable in Schedule 3B.
19. All preferences for schools within Lewisham LA will be considered by the relevant admission authorities without reference to rank order to comply with paragraph 1.9 of the School Admissions Code 2014. When the admission authorities within Lewisham LA have provided a list of applicants in criteria order to this LA, Lewisham shall, for each applicant to its schools for whom more than one potential offer is available, use the highest ranked preference to decide which single potential offer to make. This is the ‘Equal Preference System’.

20. Lewisham LA will carry out all reasonable checks to ensure that pupil rankings are correctly held in its LAS before uploading data to the PLR.

21. Lewisham LA will upload the highest potential offer available to an applicant for a maintained school or academy in this LA to the PLR by 16 March 2017. The PLR will transmit the highest potential offer specified by the Maintaining LA to the Home LA.

22. Lewisham’s LAS will eliminate, as a Home LA, all but the highest ranked offer where an applicant has more than one potential offer across Maintaining LAs submitting information within deadline to the PLR. This will involve exchanges of preference outcomes between the LAS and the PLR (in accordance with the iterative timetable published in the Business User Guide) which will continue until notification that a steady state has been achieved or until 24 March 2017 if this is sooner.

23. Lewisham LA will not make an additional offer between the end of the iterative process and the 18 April 2017 which may impact on an offer being made by another participating LA.

24. Notwithstanding paragraph 23, if an error is identified within the allocation of places at a school in Lewisham, this LA will attempt to manually resolve the allocation to correct the error. Where this impacts on another LA (either as a home or maintaining LA) Lewisham LA will liaise with that LA to attempt to resolve the correct offer and any multiple offers which might occur. However, if another LA is unable to resolve a multiple offer, or if the impact is too far reaching, this LA will accept that the applicant(s) affected might receive a multiple offer.

25. Lewisham LA will participate in the offer data checking exercise scheduled between 27 March and 10 April 2017 in the Pan-London timetable in Schedule 3B.

26. Lewisham LA will send a file to the E-Admissions portal with outcomes for all resident applicants who have applied online no later than 12 April 2017.

Offers

27. Lewisham LA will ensure, so far as is reasonably practical, that each resident applicant who cannot be offered a preference expressed on the Common Application Form, receives the offer of an alternative school place. Usually this will be the closest school to the home address where there is still a vacancy after the allocation of places.

28. Lewisham LA will inform all resident applicants of their highest offer of a school place and, where relevant, the reasons why higher preferences were not
offered, whether they were for schools in Lewisham LA or in other participating LAs.

29. Lewisham LA's outcome letter will include the information set out in Schedule 2.

30. Lewisham LA will, on 18 April 2017, send by first class post notification of the outcome to resident applicants who made a paper application.

31. Lewisham LA will provide its maintained nursery and primary schools with destination data of its resident applicants via the School Admissions Module (SAM) which will be available after 19 April 2017.

Post Offer

32. Lewisham LA will request that resident applicants accept or decline the offer of a place by 2 May 2017, or within two weeks of the date of any subsequent offer.

33. Where an applicant resident in Lewisham LA accepts or declines a place in a school maintained by another LA by 2 May 2017, Lewisham LA will forward the information to the maintaining LA by 9 May 2017. Where such information is received from applicants after 2 May, Lewisham LA will pass it to the maintaining LA as it is received.

34. Where a place becomes available in an oversubscribed maintained school or academy in Lewisham’s area, it will be offered from a waiting list ordered in accordance with paragraph 2.14 of the School Admissions Code 2014.

35. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA will inform the home LA, where different, of an offer for a maintained school or Academy in Lewisham LA’s area which can be made to an applicant resident in the home LA’s area, in order that the home LA can offer the place.

36. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA and the admission authorities within it, will not inform an applicant resident in another LA that a place can be offered.

37. When acting as a home LA, Lewisham LA will offer a place at a maintained school or Academy in the area of another LA to an applicant resident in its area, provided that the school is ranked higher on the Common Application Form than any school already offered.

38. When acting as a home LA, when Lewisham LA is informed by a maintaining LA of an offer which can be made to an applicant resident in this LA’s area which is ranked lower on the Common Application Form than any school already offered, it will inform the maintaining LA that the offer will not be made.

39. When acting as a home LA, when Lewisham LA has agreed to a change of preference order for good reason, it will inform any maintaining LA affected by the change. In such cases, paragraphs 36 and 37 shall apply to the revised order of preferences.

40. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA will inform the home LA, where different, of any change to an applicant's offer status as soon as it occurs.

41. When acting as a maintaining LA, Lewisham LA will accept new applications from home LAs for maintained schools and academies in its area.
42. Waiting lists - Requests to be placed on a waiting list for a school in Lewisham must be made via the home LA. In accordance with the pan London agreement, and to ensure Lewisham meets its duty to continue to co-ordinate admissions beyond offer date and comply with the parents’ highest possible preference, Lewisham will ensure that waiting lists do not contain lower ranked preferences except where it (or the home LA) has agreed to a parental request to change the order of preferences. In such cases, where there is a parental request to change the order of preferences, the original application, including any offer made under co-ordination, will be withdrawn and the applicant will be required to re-apply.

The reception co-ordinated scheme continues until the end of July 2017. Applications received for reception class beyond July 2017 will be considered as In Year applications.

Waiting lists for community schools in Lewisham will be held for the first term of the reception year only. Those wishing to apply for a place beyond the first term of the reception year will be required to make an in year application.

Waiting lists for Lewisham’s community schools will include those who have moved to the area and were unable to make an ‘ontime’ application. Enquiries about waiting list positions or appeal procedures for community schools in the borough should contact Lewisham’s Admissions Team.
PAN-LONDON CO-ORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME
SCHEDULE 1

Minimum Content of Common Application Form for Admissions to Year 7 and Reception in 2017/18

Child’s details:
Surname
Forename(s)
Middle name(s)
Date of Birth
Gender
Home address
Name of current school
Address of current school (if outside home LA)

Parent’s details:
Title
Surname
Forename
Address (if different to child’s address)
Telephone Number (Home, Daytime, Mobile)
Email address
Relationship to child

Preference details (x 6):
Name of school
Address of school
Preference ranking
Local authority in which the school is based

Additional information:
Reasons for Preferences (including any medical or social reasons)
Is the child a ‘Child Looked After’ (CLA)? Y/N
Is the child formally CLA but now adopted or subject to a Child Arrangements Order or Special Guardianship Order? Y/N
If yes, name of responsible local authority
Surname of sibling
Forename of sibling
DOB of sibling
Gender of sibling
Name of school sibling attends

Other:
Signature of parent or guardian
Date of signature

* Lewisham will take steps to ensure that no application for a child with an Educational Health Care plan (EHCp) or a statement of special educational needs will be sent via the PLR.
Dear Parent,

Application for a Secondary / Primary School

I am writing to let you know the outcome of your application for a secondary/primary school. Your child has been offered a place at X School. The school will write to you with further details.

I am sorry that it was not possible for your child to be offered a place at any of the schools which you listed as a higher preference on your application form. For each of these schools there were more applications than places, and other applicants had a higher priority than your child under the school’s published admission criteria.

Offers which could have been made for any schools which you placed lower in your preference list, were automatically withdrawn under the co-ordinated admission arrangements, as a higher preference has been offered.

If you would like more information about the reason that your child was not offered a place at any higher preference school, you should contact the admission authority that is responsible for admissions to the school within the next few days. Details of the different admission authorities for schools in the borough of Lewisham are attached to this letter. If the school is outside the borough of Lewisham, the admission authority will either be the borough in which the school is situated, or the school itself.

You have the right of appeal under the School Standards & Framework Act 1998 against the refusal of a place at any of the schools for which you have applied. If you wish to appeal, you must contact the admission authority for the school within the next few days to obtain the procedure and the date by which an appeal must be received by them.

Please would you confirm that you wish to accept the place at X School by completing the reply slip below. If you do not wish to accept the place, you will need to let me know what alternative arrangements you are making for your child’s education.

Your child’s name has been placed on the waiting list for any school which was a higher preference on your application than the school you have been offered. If you need to find out your child’s position on the waiting list please contact the admissions authority or the borough in which the school is situated.

If you have any questions about this letter, please contact the Admissions Team on 020 8314 8282

Please return the reply slip by 15 March 2017 (sec)/2 May 2017 (prim).

(First preference offer letters will include the paragraphs in italics only)
## PAN-LONDON CO-ORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME

**SCHEDULE 3A**

### Timetable for Admissions to Year 7 in 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fri 21 Oct 2016</td>
<td>Published closing date (Friday before half-term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 31 Oct 2016</td>
<td>Statutory deadline for receipt of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 11 Nov 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for the transfer of application information by the Home LA to the PLR (ADT file).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12 Dec 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for the upload of late applications to the PLR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 13 Dec 2016 – Tuesday 3 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Checking of application data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 3 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for the transfer of potential offer information from Maintaining LAs to the PLR (ALT file)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 16 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Final ALT file to PLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 17 - Thursday 23 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Checking of offer data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 24 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for on-line ALT file to portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 1 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Results published (evening for online applicants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 15 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for return of acceptances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 22 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for transfer of acceptances to maintaining LAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 15 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Statutory deadline for receipt of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for the transfer of application information by the Home LA to the PLR (ADT file)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for the upload of late applications to the PLR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 17 Feb – Tuesday 23 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Checking of application data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 16 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for the transfer of potential offer information from the Maintaining LAs to the PLR (ALT file).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 24 Mar 2017</td>
<td>Final ALT file to PLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 27 Mar – Monday 10 Apr 2017</td>
<td>Checking of offer data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 12 Apr 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for on-line ALT file to portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 18 April 2017</td>
<td>Results published (evening for online applicants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2 May 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for receipt of acceptances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9 May 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for transfer of acceptances to maintaining LAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEWISHAM’S SCHEME FOR THE CO-ORDINATION OF IN-YEAR
ADMISSIONS FOR MAINTAINED SCHOOLS AND ACADEMIES IN
LEWISHAM   2017/18

Section 1: Applications

1. Applications from Lewisham and non-Lewisham residents for all maintained schools, including Academies, in Lewisham will be made directly to Lewisham’s admission team. The in-year application forms will be available from Lewisham’s website at www.lewisham.gov.uk

2. Lewisham residents applying for places at maintained schools and academies outside Lewisham will need to apply directly to the LA in whose area the school is situated.

3. The admission authorities in Lewisham will not use supplementary forms except where the information available through the Common Application Form is insufficient for consideration of the application against the published oversubscription criteria. Where supplementary forms are used by the admissions authorities within Lewisham, Lewisham’s admission team will seek to ensure that these only collect information which is required by the published oversubscription criteria, in accordance with the School Admissions Code.

4. Where supplementary forms are used, they will be available from the school concerned and available on the school’s website. Any supplementary forms must advise parents that they must also complete Lewisham’s in-year application form. Lewisham’s admission booklet and website will indicate which schools in Lewisham require supplementary forms to be completed and where they can be obtained. Parents will be advised that they should complete the supplementary form so that the school’s Governing Body can fully consider their application.

5. Where an admission authority school in Lewisham receives a supplementary form, it will not consider it to be a valid application until the parent has also listed the school on Lewisham’s In-Year Application Form.

6. Applicants will be able to express a preference for up to three maintained primary/secondary schools or Academies in Lewisham.

7. The order of preference given on the In-Year Application Form will not be revealed to the schools listed on the In-Year application form.

8. Lewisham undertakes to carry out address verification for each application made to a maintained school or academy in Lewisham. Where Lewisham is not satisfied as to the validity of an address of an applicant it will advise the admission authority schools.

9. Lewisham will satisfy itself that each applicant’s date of birth is correct.
10. Lewisham will check the status of any applicant who is a 'Looked After or was previously looked after but immediately after being looked after became subject to an adoption, residence, or special guardianship order."

Section 2: Processing

11. Lewisham will enter each pupil’s preferences onto the admissions database. This information will be available to admission authority schools via the School Admissions Module (SAM) to enable them to consider the application in accordance with their published oversubscription criteria. Admissions authority schools should respond to an application within 10 school days.

12. For all applicants, Lewisham will provide schools with the information contained in the In-Year Application Form (see Schedule 1 below).

13. Where an application is not fully completed, including address verification, Lewisham will not treat the application as valid until all information is received.

14. If a pupil is currently on roll at a school in Lewisham or a school in a neighbouring borough, the parent will be advised to discuss the transfer with the Headteacher or senior Teacher at the school.

15. Lewisham’s in year iCAF, will request background information from the current/previous school to support the enrolment meeting or to determine whether the application qualifies at a Fair Access admission.

Section 3: Offers

16. If a school has a vacancy/vacancies, Lewisham will be expected to offer the place(s) within 10 school days of the vacancy arising to the next child entitled to a place in accordance with the published oversubscription criteria. The school must make reasonable attempts to contact the parent. If a school receives fewer applications than places available, places must be offered to all of the children unless the pupil has had a permanent exclusion from the last school.

17. Lewisham’s admissions team will write to parents who have not been offered places at their preferences schools giving reasons and informing them of their right of appeal to an independent appeal in accordance with the School Standards and Framework Act 1988.

18. Lewisham will notify the Home LA of the outcome of applications for their residents

18. When Lewisham is notified that a pupil has been offered a place at a higher preference school, the lower ranking preferences will be withdrawn and the schools concerned notified.
19. Schools must place the child on roll by the date agreed with the School Admissions and Appeals Team.

20. Children transferring from one local school to another may not transfer to the new school until the start of the following half term unless both the home school and receiving school agrees.

21. Federations will have an important role in apportioning admissions among the schools in the federation.

22. If an admission is disputed by a school, the case must be referred to the Admissions Team giving detailed written reasons within 5 school days. The child’s placement will be discussed at the next Fair Access Panel. Lewisham reserves the right to direct admission if necessary.

23. When Lewisham is notified that a pupil has been offered a place at a lower preference school, the higher preferences will also be withdrawn unless the parent indicates otherwise.

24. Acting as Home LA, where an applicant who is out of school cannot be offered a place at one of their named preferences, Lewisham will offer an alternative school place.

25. It will be assumed that parents will accept the offer of a school place unless they formally decline the offer of a place and confirm what alternative arrangements they are making for their child’s education.

26. Where Lewisham is informed that another LA is able to offer a place from the waiting list to one of its residents, Lewisham’s database will be updated accordingly.

27. Waiting lists for schools in Lewisham will be held for the academic year in which the application was made. Waiting lists will not be carried over from one academic year to the next and parents will be required to reapply for subsequent academic years.
SCHEDULE 1

This LA’s In-Year Application Form will contain the following fields.

Child’s details:

- Surname
- Forename(s)
- Middle Name(s)
- Home Address
- Date of Birth
- Gender
- Name, address and dates of attendance of current/previous school(s)
- If currently in school, reason for transfer
- Date place is required
- Permanent exclusions
- Is the child Looked After?

Parent’s/Carer’s details:

- Title
- Initials
- Forename
- Surname
- Address (if different to child’s address)
- Telephone Number(s)
- Relationship to Child
- Parental Responsibility?

Preference details (minimum of 3):

- Name and DCSF number of school
- Preference ranking
- Local Authority in which the school is based
- Sibling Details
- Reasons for Preference (including any medical or social needs)

Other:

- Declaration including consequences of providing false information
- Signature of parent or carer
- Date of signature
- Data Protection notice
- Checklist including advice about completing supplementary forms
Lewisham’s timetable for processing preference data (reception and secondary transfer admissions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 15 January 2017</td>
<td>Supplementary Information form to be returned to direct to the school</td>
<td>By 31 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10 February 2017</td>
<td>Lewisham’s deadline for uploading ‘late for good reason’ applications</td>
<td>Monday 12 December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 18 April 2017</td>
<td>Results of applications made by the closing date posted by first class post to those who made a paper application</td>
<td>Wednesday 1 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evening of 18 April 2017</td>
<td>Results available to those who made their application on line</td>
<td>The evening of 1 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 2 May 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for accepting an offer</td>
<td>Wednesday 15 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 9 May 2017</td>
<td>Deadline for submitting an appeal for a community school</td>
<td>Wednesday 22 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – July 2017</td>
<td>Appeals heard for community schools</td>
<td>June – July 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the time of submission for the Agenda, I confirm that the report has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Comments from Exec Director for Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Comments from the Head of Law</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Implications</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Implications</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Implications/Impact Assessment (as appropriate)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed Adherence to Budget &amp; Policy Framework</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment Comments (as appropriate)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Urgency (as appropriate)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: [Signature]  
Executive Member

Date: 2-2-16

Signed: [Signature]  
Director/Head of Service

Date: 2-2-16
# Summary

1.1. The Council received an application from a community group called Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA) for the designation of a Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area in Deptford.

1.2. The Council have completed two periods of public consultation with the local community in relation to the applications. The first period of public consultation took place between 7th October 2015 and 19th November 2015 and the second took place between 11th December 2015 and 22nd January 2016.

1.3. Council officers have assessed the applications as meeting the required conditions for formal designation as set out in the relevant legislation. Officers recommend designating both the DNA Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area apportioned within the London Borough of Lewisham (LBL).

1.4. The formal designation of the DNA Neighbourhood Forum and Neighbourhood Area would allow the forum to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for the Neighbourhood Area.

# Purpose

2.1. This report seeks the Mayor’s approval for the formal designation of DNA applications for the Neighbourhood Forum and a Neighbourhood Area. Formal designation would allow the Forum to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan.
3. **Recommendations**

3.1. The Mayor is recommended to approve the designation of the DNA Neighbourhood Area as set out at Annex 3.

3.2. The Mayor is recommended to designate the Deptford Neighbourhood Action Neighbourhood Forum as set out at Annex 2.

3.3. The Mayor is recommended to authorise the Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration to undertake the required publicity of the designations.

4. **Policy Context**

4.1. The Localism Act (2011) allows Neighbourhood Forums to prepare Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP) and Neighbourhood Development Orders (NDO).

4.2. NDPs are prepared by the local community but formally Made (that is approved or adopted) by the Council after a successful referendum that is organised by the Council. Once Made they become part of the Development Plan for the borough and as such are part of the Council’s policy framework that must be considered when making decisions on planning applications.

4.3. NDOs are a form of planning permission for a specific development proposal.

4.4. This report, recommending the creation of the DNA Neighbourhood Forum and the designation of the DNA Neighbourhood Area (apportioned within the London Borough of Lewisham) supports the Council’s Corporate Priorities and the objectives outlined in the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy. This is because the proposed DNA Forum’s purpose is to “promote and improve the social, economic and environmental well-being of the neighbourhood area”. This is taken from their constitution and is required by the Localism Act 2011.

4.5. In particular, this report supports the Council Priority ‘Community Leadership and Empowerment: developing opportunities for the active participation and engagement of people in the life of the community’. This report also supports the Sustainable Community Strategy policy objective ‘Empowered and Responsible: where people can be actively involved in their local area and contribute to supportive communities’. Consequently, the Council is committed to empowering local residents to play an active role in the life of the borough. This is because the proposed Neighbourhood Forum would give people another way to influence decision making and to have a say in the way that their neighbourhood develops through the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. In addition, the Sustainable Community Strategy states that to support the empowered and responsible communities, “we will work together to promote volunteering and the activity of voluntary and community organisations”. It should be noted that Neighbourhood Forums are made up of volunteers and the proposed forum’s constitution states that the preparation,
development and production of Neighbourhood Development Plan will aim to encourage community cohesion and citizenship.

4.6. This report also supports the Sustainable Community Strategy objective of ‘clean, green and liveable: where people live in affordable, high quality and adaptable housing, have access to green spaces and take responsibility for their impact on the environment’. The purpose of the proposed Neighbourhood Forum is to protect and maximise the amount and quality of green space and increase the provision of quality social and affordable housing amongst other objectives.

5. **Background**

5.1. The Localism Act (2011) enables local communities to influence the planning of their area by preparing NDPs and NDOs. In areas such as Lewisham where there are no Parish Councils a Neighbourhood Forum must be designated by the Council to obtain the right to prepare a NDP or NDO.

5.2. NDPs are led by local people so that they can set out how they want their local area to develop. Local people set out the vision and planning policies for their own neighbourhood. NDPs are about local issues rather than strategic planning issues. They must take account of national planning policy and be in ‘general conformity’ with the existing adopted strategic planning policies for Lewisham. The government’s aim is that they will promote development, they are not about attempts to prevent development.

5.3. When the plan has been through all the stages of preparation, examination and a successful referendum the Council can make the NDP. The NDP will then become a statutory planning document which will form a part of the Borough’s development plan. When determining planning applications the law provides that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.4. A NDP is a plan which sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in a Neighbourhood Area. It may contain a range of policies or proposals for land use development that will carry weight in the determination of planning applications.

5.5. In this context the Local Planning Authorities’ (LPAs) responsibilities which can be summarised as:

- Agreeing and designating the area of the neighbourhood plan
- Designating a neighbourhood forum
- Providing advice and support to the neighbourhood forum in preparing the neighbourhood plan
- Arranging and paying for an Independent Examination of the neighbourhood plan
- Arranging and paying for a local referendum
5.6. There are specific requirements set out in the Act and the neighbourhood planning regulations for Neighbourhood Forums to be designated as qualifying bodies.

5.7. The regulations require that for an application to be designated a Neighbourhood Forum and/or Area therefore must include, amongst other things, the following information:

- A copy of the written constitution of the proposed forum
- A map showing the proposed neighbourhood area
- A statement explaining how the proposed forum is established to promote or improve the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area
- A statement explaining that membership is drawn from different places in the neighbourhood area and from different sections of the community
- A list of at least 21 individual members of the proposed forum.

5.8. The proposed DNA Neighbourhood Area is a cross borough area and includes parts of the LBL and a smaller part of the Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG) to the eastern portion of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Each authority only has the power to determine the Neighbourhood Area that falls within their own borough boundary. Similarly, each authority can only determine whether the proposed Neighbourhood Forum can act within the part of the Neighbourhood Area that falls within their borough boundary. Therefore, the DNA community group has had to submit separate applications to both LBL and RBG.

5.9. The DNA Neighbourhood Forum and Area applications were received by the planning service in August 2015. The planning service checked that the correct paperwork had been submitted and then arranged for the statutory six week publicity to be given to both applications. The decision was made to carry out the first publicity campaign jointly with RBG. The first period of public consultation was carried out between 7th October 2015 and 19th November 2015 and the second period of public consultation was carried out between 11th December 2015 and 22nd January 2016.

5.10. The designation of a Neighbourhood Forum and a Neighbourhood Area are two separate processes, which can be undertaken simultaneously. Section 7 of this report considers whether the forum application meets the statutory requirements, and section 8 of this report considers whether the area application meets the statutory requirements.

6. Public consultation

6.1. The Neighbourhood Planning (General Regulations) 2012 (as amended) require the Council to undertake the public consultation in relation to the proposal and in accordance with the Regulations.

6.2. Both applications were placed on the planning policy webpage and comments invited. In addition to this statutory requirement, a publicity notice was
circulated to households and commercial premises in the proposed Neighbourhood Area and in a further 150m buffer zone around the proposed Neighbourhood Area so that those on the boundary would have the opportunity to comment. A letter or email was sent to all local people on the planning policy data base inviting comment and providing details of where further information could be obtained. The applications and associated information were also placed in the planning information office at Laurence House and at the library at Deptford Lounge for people to inspect. The first round of public consultation lasted for six weeks, from 7th October 2015 to 19th November 2015. A total of 25 representations were made.

6.3. Given the low response rate, officers decided to hold a second period of public consultation. The second period of public consultation took place between 11th December 2015 to 22nd January 2016.

6.4. Officers decided to undertake a second round of public consultation using additional consultation methods to maximise public outreach. Therefore, rather than circulate another round of leaflets, officers erected approximately 25 posters throughout the part of the Neighbourhood Area that falls within the LBL. Officers also requested a poster be displayed at the Deptford library. Letters were sent via post to any properties that were known to have been inaccessible to the leaflet distribution company. The applications were published on the Lewisham Council website.

6.5. A further ten responses were received during the second round of public consultation.

6.6. During the course of both consultation periods, 35 responses were received: 29 from members of the public and 6 from statutory organisations. 17 of the responses that were made by members of the public were sent in by people with postcodes from within the proposed Neighbourhood Area, six were from members of the public that held postcodes from outside of the area. A further six representations were received from people who declined to supply their postcode.

6.7. A total of 24 representations received generally supported all or part (either area or forum) of the applications, and two outright objections to all or part (either area or forum) were received. A summary of these responses can be found in annex 1 of this report.

6.8. There were 18 responses made that explicitly supported the proposed Neighbourhood Forum. The summary of the main reasons for supporting the proposed Neighbourhood Forum is as follows:

- DNA have consulted well and come up with some good proposals for the area.
- Deptford is changing rapidly and needs a strong local voice to ensure it isn’t changed just for developers to make a quick profit.
- This will be an important opportunity to have a say regarding local needs, as well as a means of sustaining rather than alienating communities.
- A Neighbourhood Forum is needed in Deptford.
- With a population that is perceived as socially low-status, it has always been difficult for Deptford to make its voice heard above the clamour of private and public vested interests. The establishment of a Neighbourhood Forum would offer a platform for that voice to be heard more distinctly, as regards the development of the town.
- A Neighbourhood Forum is certainly one important avenue through which can be focused a productive sense of communal unity.
- [DNA] seem competent to put together a Plan that could express what local people want.

6.9. Additionally, two respondents offered qualified support for the proposed Forum, stating that they would support the proposal if the area was expanded to include the following or their own property:

- Brookmill Road included at least as far as Elverson Road but ideally including the conservation area up to St John’s station.
- The Woodpecker neighbourhood (Milton Court, Ludwick Mews estates, Five Ways Tennant Management Cooperative and other estates adjacent to Fordham Park), or
- The boundary should run down Sanford Street then eastward along Edward Street.

6.10. Of the responses, one response submitted a qualified objection that the forum would not be supported if the respondent was not able to participate. As the respondent lived outside the proposed Neighbourhood Area, it is assumed that they may not be able to join the forum and therefore, the objection stands. In the same thread, the respondent raised a concern that the forum is being created to resist change/development.

6.11. One outright objection to the proposed Forum (as applied for) was received. A summary of the main reasons for this objection are as follows:

- A majority of DNA active members are active in other areas
- Membership recruitment can meet qualifying regulations but still be contained and extraneous to the neighbourhood locality.
- It is an easy opportunity for a clique to gain influence and funding for their own interests and agenda over long term local residents’ needs and concerns
- Long standing and community minded residents are aware that the current members of DNA have very little connection or knowledge of the Deptford area or issues
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• Any planning involvement they may have will no doubt NOT focus on the long standing problems of the area but a project for housing themselves under the community sustainability banner.

6.12. Officers have included a full officer response to these objections that can be found within Annex 1 of this report.

6.13. Of the responses, 17 explicitly stated that they supported the proposed Neighbourhood Area. A summary of the reasons are as follows:

• I especially like that the boundary includes areas that are part of the Deptford community but are in Greenwich borough, in fact I was surprised that areas that I’ve always thought of as Deptford (everything west of the creek) are in a different borough to me.
• It is my view that the riparian ‘Deptford’, as defined, is a wholly appropriate example of a distinct neighbourhood for the following reasons: It is a historic town with a distinct and internationally-known heritage; It has an economic, cultural and demographic character that distinguishes it sharply from the rest of the two London Boroughs within which it stands

6.14. Two respondents stated that the area is incorrect. A summary of the main reasons for this are:

• The extent of the area is too large and I do not believe that the northern part of Deptford (Surrey Quays) reflects that of the south area. Therefore, I don’t see how residents of the south would positively contribute to the development in the north and visa versa.
• I do not consider the area proposed boundary as offered by DNA to be representative of the people that live in Deptford as it chooses to leave out areas of Deptford, with a postcode of SE8. I am aware that the argument for this boundary is that the area is considered to be St John’s but I do not consider it to be St John’s. Stealing part of Deptford to link with Greenwich whilst leaving out other Deptford residents is just not on.

6.15. Additionally, two respondents offered qualified support for the Neighbourhood Area, on the basis that it is extended as per paragraph 6.9 of this report.

6.16. Historic England provided a fairly neutral comment to recommend the inclusion of the conservation area in their entirety. In this case, Historic England recommended that it would be beneficial to extend the proposed neighbourhood boundary to encompass the small area of New Cross Road to the west of Florence Street, part of the Deptford High Street Conservation Area, so that a consistent approach can be taken to buildings within the designated area. Lewisham’s Senior Conservation Officer concurred and added that the Deptford Conservation Area has just undergone a review. It has highlighted the potential for including the mid 19th century terraces along New Cross Road between Florence Road and Watson’s Street in the east and
the railway bridge/railway station to the west into the conservation area. Lewisham’s Senior Conservation Officer added that it would be preferable to have this stretch of the southern side of New Cross Road included in order to ensure that policies are applied consistently for both sides of the street and for the small area that is within the Deptford High Street Conservation Area but currently not included in the Neighbourhood Area.

6.17. It should be noted that the Localism Act 2011 does not make provision for the Mayor to extend the boundary of the Neighbourhood Area further than the area that has been applied for through the application. Therefore, another application would have to be submitted to include these areas. Given that the policies of any forthcoming NDP would have to comply with the strategic policies of the Council’s borough plan, it is considered that there would not be significant disadvantage to the small part of the conservation area, although the preference to include conservation areas in their entirety.

7. DNA Neighbourhood Forum application

7.1. Section 61F (5) and (7) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted into the Act by the Localism Act, Schedule 9) sets out the conditions that a neighbourhood forum must meet, as well as the detailed considerations that a LPA must take into account when determining an application for the designation of a neighbourhood forum.

7.2. In assessing the application for a neighbourhood forum the Council will consider the application against the conditions and considerations set out in legislation and in doing so will to ensure that the proposed forum is representative of its area.

7.3. The legislation states that a LPA may designate an organisation or body as a neighbourhood forum if the authority is satisfied that the following four conditions have been met. The legislation does not require applicants to give more than the basic information. The four conditions are considered below:

   i) Established for the express purpose of promoting or improving the social, economic or environmental well-being of an area

7.4. Response: The written constitution states that the “purpose of the Forum is to promote or improve the social, economic and environmental well-being of the area”.

7.5. The written stated purpose of the Forum meets the legal requirement for the forum to be established for the express purpose of promoting or improving the social, economic or environmental well-being of an area.

   ii) Membership is open to individuals who live or work in the area (or are elected members of the Council whose area falls within the Neighbourhood Area concerned)
7.6. **Response:** The constitution states membership is open to all people aged 16 or over that:

- live within the Neighbourhood Area;
- work in the Neighbourhood Area either on a paid or voluntary basis;
- Are an elected Lewisham or Greenwich London Borough Council member representing a ward in the Neighbourhood Area.

7.7. The Forum constitution as written therefore meets membership eligibility requirements set out in the legislation.

iii) Membership includes a minimum of 21 individuals each of whom lives or works (or is an elected member) in the area

7.8. **Response:** The information submitted with the forum application included the names of 39 members, comprising of:

- 18 residents of the area,
- 12 business owners / workers (paid or voluntary) in the area
- Six people that live and work in the area, and
- Three elected member for the area.

7.9. It is noted that six of the forum proposers have failed to supply their full postcode and one forum proposer that is stated to live and work in the area falls just outside of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. Nevertheless, the proposed forum surpasses the legislative requirements of 21 eligible members.

iv) The Neighbourhood Forum has a written constitution

7.10. **Response:** The applicant has provided a written constitution, which is available as Annex 2 to this report.

7.11. In addition to the four conditions set out above, the legislation also states that a LPA has to have regard to three further considerations, which are addressed below:

i) The desirability of designating an organisation or body which has secured (or taken steps to secure) membership from each of the required categories (i.e. people who live, work or are elected members).

7.12. **Response:** The information submitted with the forum application included the names of 39 members, comprising of:

- 18 residents of the area,
- 12 business owners / workers (paid or voluntary) in the area
- Six people that live and work in the area, and
- Three elected member for the area.

7.13. It is noted that six of the forum proposers have failed to supply their full postcode and one forum proposer that is stated to live and work in the area
falls just outside of the proposed neighbourhood area. Nevertheless, the proposed forum surpasses the legislative requirements of 21 eligible members.

7.14. Although an objection has been received relating to the make up of the proposed DNA Neighbourhood Forum, officers consider that the DNA Neighbourhood Forum meets the legislative requirements.

   ii) Whether membership is drawn from different places in the Neighbourhood Area concerned and from different sections of the community in the area.

7.15. **Response**: The map overleaf shows the geographic distribution of members of the proposed DNA Neighbourhood Forum.

7.16. Although there is a notable cluster of members southeast of the proposed Neighbourhood Area and around Deptford High Street / the old Tidemill School in particular, membership is drawn from different places within the proposed Neighbourhood Area.

7.17. Members are also from different sections of the community. Membership includes residents of different areas; workers, and three elected councillors from Lewisham.
iii) Whether the purpose of the Neighbourhood Forum reflects (in general terms) the character of the area.

7.18. **Response:** The purpose of the Neighbourhood Forum, as set out in section 3 of the application made for the forum is to encourage, empower and enable the involvement of all communities living and working in the defined Neighbourhood Area in the preparation, production and implementation of the NDP which will aim to:

- [provide] An identity for Deptford.
- Encourage community cohesion and active citizenship.
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• Improve the health of the local community.
• Promote and develop places for all creative communities to flourish.
• Increase the provision and quality of social and affordable housing for local people on low and middle incomes.
• Promote the safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
• Protect and maximise the amount and quality of green space, open and public spaces in the promotion of a healthier environment.
• Promote and protect all forms of Deptford heritage and identities.

7.19. Therefore, it is considered that the purpose of the Neighbourhood Forum is reflective of the character of the area in general terms.

Neighbourhood Forum Application conclusion

7.20. The Neighbourhood Forum application meets the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) (as amended) and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012). It is recommended that the forum be designated as such by the Mayor.

8. DNA Neighbourhood Area application

8.1. Section 61G of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted into the Act by the Localism Act, Schedule 9) sets out the conditions that an application for a Neighbourhood Area must meet, as well as the considerations that a LPA should take into account when determining an application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area.

8.2. LBL does not contain any parish councils, therefore a number of the conditions and considerations do not apply. In light of these facts, there are two conditions and considerations relevant to this application, which are addressed in turn below.

   i) The application is submitted by a body which is capable of being designated as a Neighbourhood Forum.

8.3. This condition is met in the case of the application made by the proposed DNA Neighbourhood Forum. The assessment found in section 7 of this report outlines that the applicant is capable of being formally designated as a Neighbourhood Forum.

   ii) The area does not overlap with an existing Neighbourhood Area.

8.4. The proposed Neighbourhood Area does not overlap with an existing Neighbourhood Area. Therefore the condition is met.

   ii) Whether the area is considered to be an appropriate area.

8.5. The legislation does not provide a framework for assessing the suitability of a proposed Neighbourhood Area beyond stating that the local authority can
refuse an application if the proposed area is considered to not be “an appropriate area”.

8.6. There are no minimum or maximum size limits for neighbourhood areas, and there is no requirement to follow administrative boundaries.

8.7. The National Planning Policy Guidance states that applicants should use their understanding and knowledge of the geography and character of their neighbourhood when proposing an area. The Guidance sets out further considerations including catchment areas for shops and services, formal and informal community networks, and physical characteristics of the area.

8.8. The applicant has provided an ‘Appropriate Area Statement’ which explains the rationale that led to the proposed boundaries for the Deptford Neighbourhood Action Area. The applicants’ note that the rationale can be described through four lenses:

- Natural barriers such as waterways
- Human made physical boundaries such as railways, major roads (A2) and green spaces.
- Administrative boundaries (existing ones such as borough and ward boundaries, Evelyn, New Cross and Brockley Ward as well as historic ones such as the old Deptford Borough boundary).

8.9. The area crosses the boundary of three wards in Lewisham as well as crossing over the boundary with the Royal Borough of Greenwich. This is acceptable in principle as there is no requirement to follow administrative boundaries.

8.10. The applicant’s justification for the proposed area boundary is considered acceptable. The proposed boundary is considered to be an appropriate size for a neighbourhood area, and is considered to reflect the local physical and social characteristics.

8.11. In conclusion, it is considered that the part of the proposed area that falls within LBL’s jurisdiction is an appropriate one, and that area should be formally designated as a Neighbourhood Area.

9. Legal implications

9.1. The Localism Act allows local communities to shape their areas through the use of Neighbourhood Development Plans, which will set out policies in relation to the development and use of land in a particular neighbourhood.

9.2. By virtue of section 61 G (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act a neighbourhood area is an area of a local authority which has been designated as such by the authority as a neighbourhood area. The power to designate only arises where a relevant body, as defined by section 61G(2) has applied to the LPA for designation of a neighbourhood area.
9.3. A relevant body includes a body “which is or is capable of being” designated a neighbourhood forum. The designation of a Neighbourhood Area and Neighbourhood Forum may be dealt with under one report, but are two separate decisions.

9.4. The discretion given to local authorities by section 61G is broad for the designation of the neighbourhood area. The exercise of that discretion turns on the factual and policy considerations which exist in the individual case at the time the determination is made.

9.5. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

9.6. In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

9.7. The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the Mayor, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

9.8. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: [link]

9.9. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

9.10. The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/

10. Equalities Implications

10.1. The Council’s Comprehensive Equality Scheme for 2012-16 provides an overarching framework and focus for the Council's work on equalities and helps ensure compliance with the Equality Act 2010.

10.2. The Council will need to advise the Neighbourhood Forum if an Equalities Analysis Assessment (EAA) should be prepared as part of the preparation of the neighbourhood plan.

10.3. An EAA is the process of systematically analysing a proposed policy to identify what effect, or likely effect, will follow from the implementation of a policy for different groups in the community. By undertaking the EAA as part of the NP process it will ensure that equalities impacts have been fully taken into account in a systematic way.

11. Financial Implications

11.1. There are no additional costs to the Council arising from this report. The planning service have a duty to support Neighbourhood Forums in preparing neighbourhood plans and to this end there is an impact on the planning service in terms of staff time however these costs will be contained within the existing planning service budget. In addition, Central Government currently offers financial assistance to local authorities though the provision of grants. Currently local authorities can apply for a grant of £5,000 after the designation of a Neighbourhood Area and another £5,000 after the designation of a Neighbourhood Forum.

12. Environmental Implications

12.1. There are no specific environmental implications arising from this report.
13. **Conclusion**

13.1. Officers consider that the applications meet the requirements of the relevant legislation.

13.2. Officers consider that the proposed Forum’s membership is drawn from different places in the proposed Neighbourhood Area concerned and from different sections of the community in the area, and that the purpose of the Neighbourhood Forum reflects (in general terms) the character of the area.

13.3. Therefore it is recommended that the proposed Neighbourhood Forum is formally designated.

13.4. Also, officers consider the proposed Neighbourhood Area to be an appropriate neighbourhood area in regards to local physical and social characteristics.

13.5. Therefore it is recommended that the proposed Neighbourhood Area (that falls within the Lewisham Borough boundary) is formally designated.
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<th>Date</th>
<th>File Location</th>
<th>File Reference</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Exempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations as amended</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Brian Regan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town and Country Planning Act (as amended)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Brian Regan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localism Act</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Laurence House</td>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>Brian Regan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Brian Regan, Planning Policy Manager, 3rd floor Laurence House, 1 Catford Road, Catford SE6 4RU – telephone 020 8314 6438.

---

**Annex 1: Summary of consultation responses for DNA Neighbourhood Forum and Area designations**

**Annex 2: DNA Neighbourhood Forum application**

**Annex 3: DNA Neighbourhood Area application**

**Annex 4: DNA Neighbourhood Area with Borough boundary shown**
## Summary of consultation responses for DNA Neighbourhood Forum and Area applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep ID</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>I'd like to express my support for the Neighbourhood Forum and Area as a member of DNA and Local Councillor. I believe DNA have consulted well and come up with some good proposals for the area.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>As a resident who was very involved with trying to get the proposed New Cross Neighbourhood Forum off of the ground I would like to express my support for the Deptford Neighbourhood Forum and Area application. I believe that they have chosen an appropriate area and hope that their application is approved.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>I agree with the proposals set out in the application for a Neighbourhood Area and Forum in the Deptford area including the boundary, purpose and objectives.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Qualified support for neighbourhood area</td>
<td>Although I agree with the spirit of this proposal I think that the boundary is seriously wrong as it excludes a substantial part of Deptford to the West which identifies with the Deptford community and has clear ties to the proposed area. The boundary should follow the railway line into New Cross Station then eastward along New Cross road to include the area formerly known as the Woodpecker Neighbourhood: Milton Court, Ludwick Mews estates, Five Ways Tennant Management Co-operative and other estates adjacent to Fordham Park. If the above proposal is not agreed then an alternative proposal would be that the boundary should run down Sanford Street then eastward along Edward Street. This area always seems to be part of a no-mans land and the inclusion within the proposed DNA boundary would Strengthen the sense of inclusion for this area, as part of the wider Deptford Community.</td>
<td>The Mayor does not have the power to extend the boundary of the neighbourhood area further than the area that has been applied for through the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>As a resident of the area I fully support the establishment of the forum and think that the boundary suggested is really good. I especially like that the boundary includes areas that are part of the Deptford community but are in Greenwich borough, in fact I was surprised that areas that I’ve always thought of as Deptford (everything west of the creek) are in a different borough to me. One of the important roles of these forums can be to reclaim a sense of community that has been diluted with arbitrary boundaries, including ward boundaries within Lewisham.</td>
<td>No officer response required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Objection neighbourhood area</td>
<td>I do not consider the area proposed boundary as offered by DNA to be representative of the people that live in Deptford as it chooses to leave out areas of Deptford, with a postcode of SE8. I assume that I will not be able to join the debate or decide DNA Issues but as it is linked with Greenwich people they will be able to do so. I am aware that the argument for this boundary is that the area is considered to be St John’s but I do not consider it to be St John’s. I am a longstanding resident. I live and work in Deptford and have a Deptford postcode. Stealing part of Deptford to link with Greenwich whilst leaving out other Deptford residents is just not on.</td>
<td>DNA’s constitution states that those that live or work in the neighbourhood area can become a member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neutral (Sport England)</td>
<td>It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement’. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/</a> Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further information can be found following the link below: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a> Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the</td>
<td>No officer response required. Should the neighbourhood Area be designated and the Forum recognised, then a copy of the response will be passed on to the Forum to keep in mind when preparing their neighbourhood plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/</a> If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Support forum + area I agree with the proposed neighbourhood area boundary and with the purpose and objectives of the proposed forum as set out in the Forum’s constitution.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Support neighbourhood area Yes, this sounds good and should have been done years ago then there wouldn’t be this housing mess – building on land that should be left alone and parks, open spaces that should not be built on. The people that run this would have to be independable or it would not work. I agree with the proposed neighbourhood area boundary and the people inside running this. But this should be aimed at the young who will take over. This, and stopping more concrete, bricks going up. There are far too many buildings around here and too many people in one medium area which wasn’t meant for all these buildings and people. before it is ruined for good, it should stop.</td>
<td>Neighbourhood plans should not prevent or frustrate development rather, a plan should be distinct to reflect the unique characteristics and planning context of the area for which it is prepared thereby giving communities a greater say in how their neighbourhood develops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Qualified support for neighbourhood forum Will the body consider local planning issues such as excessive parking congestion and parking as well as new build? I have attended a previous forum which appeared to have considered grant allocations and planning issues, although provided little opportunity to explore and follow up on the other wider concerns of residents in the area. I think that the forum should be set up provided it focuses on the concerns of local residents</td>
<td>The Forum are at the early stages of the neighbourhood planning process. The respondent has been directed to contact the forum proposers directly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>General support I like the idea of a neighbourhood plan for this area.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Support neighbourhood forum I wanted to show my support for the Deptford Neighbourhood Action plan for a neighbourhood forum.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that Deptford is changing rapidly and needs a strong local voice to ensure it isn't changed just for developers to make a quick profit.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Support neighbourhood area</td>
<td>I am happy to hear about the proposed Deptford Neighbourhood Area and as a resident of Deptford, I am very much looking forward to having this in place. Having reviewed the plans on the Council’s website, I am satisfied with the proposed area and agree with the benefits it will bring to the area. I hope that Lewisham and Greenwich Councils will agree to put this in place.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Support neighbourhood area and forum</td>
<td>I am in favour of the DNA neighbourhood area, their purpose and objectives.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Qualified support for neighbourhood forum and area</td>
<td>I would like to see Brookmill Road included at least as far as Elverson Road but ideally including the conservation area up to St John’s station. Elverson Road is a terrible road for vandalism, the streets are littered with rubbish and abandoned household items daily. There is no sense of community in this area. There are many social and environmental issues that are not being addressed here. I would like to be part of this forum and included within the neighbourhood area boundary. The Mayor does not have the power to extend the boundary of the neighbourhood area further than the area that has been applied for through the application. A further, separate, application will be required to extend the boundary of the area, provided the area falls within the London Borough of Lewisham.</td>
<td>Officer replied clarifying the boundary and suggested contact with the proposed forum for further clarification on the boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Neutral (PLA)</td>
<td>The PLA has no objection about the application to designate the neighbourhood forum and area but would like clarification on the area to be designated. in particular, the OS map shows the boundary extending slightly into the river but not covering the mid point nor stopping on the land. It also crosses Deptford Creek at a number of locations. What is the reasoning behind included some parts of the river and creek and not others?</td>
<td>Officer replied clarifying the boundary and suggested contact with the proposed forum for further clarification on the boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Object to neighbourhood area</td>
<td>The extent of the area is too large and I do not believe that the northern part of Deptford (Surrey Quays) reflects that of the south area. Therefore, I don’t see how residents of the south would positively contribute to the development in the north and visa versa. I would not support any organisation that I couldn’t join that wants to shape my neighbourhood.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified objection to neighbourhood forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does the Council safeguard from the forum resisting development. Their mission statement is very vague and strategic so doesn’t drill down to the detail. The constitution link does not work on the webpage so I can't read this though reviewing the website it looks like it is geared towards very large development proposals. Something I consider very typical of a existing local community but understandable. I'm ultimately concerned that this forum is being created to resist change/development.</td>
<td>general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan, which includes the London Plan and the Council’s Local Plans. The NPPG states that Local Authorities must avoid pre-judging what may be contained in the draft neighbourhood plan when designating a neighbourhood area. Officers provided information on how to access the constitution to the respondent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comments provided on Neighbourhood Area boundary Historic England</td>
<td>Our comments relate to the implications of the proposed boundary for designated and undesignated heritage assets. The proposed boundary encompasses a substantial area facing a broad range of issues, from substantial riverside development, heavy traffic and the impact of post-war redevelopment. However, the boundary appears logically drawn along clearly defined physical and administrative lines. We do not therefore wish to make detailed comments regarding the Neighbourhood Forum constitution or neighbourhood area boundary. We can however offer some comments in respect of the implications for the historic environment. Ensuring a conservation area is incorporated in its entirety can ensure that relevant policies are operated in a consistent manner. In this instance, the boundary of the conservation area appears to be drawn so that it excludes a small area of New Cross Road to the west of Florence Street. It would therefore seem beneficial to extend the proposed neighbourhood boundary to encompass the conservation area so that a consistent approach can be taken to buildings within the designated area. It is also noted that the council has been engaged in an assessment of the Deptford High Street conservation areas character and it would be sensible to seek the views of the Borough Conservation Team in considering how the boundary might reflect existing and proposed heritage designations. The proposed neighbourhood area encompasses a broad range of heritage assets, as diverse as the magnificent Grade I listed St Paul’s Church, Grade II* listed sea captains houses at Albury Street, the Grade II* Mastershipwright’s House and the Grade II Olympia Boat Shed. In addition, a number of assets within the proposed boundary are identified as “at risk” including the Holland and Co. distillery at Deptford Bridge, the ramp at Deptford Station and the Deptford High Street Conservation Area... We would therefore encourage the Neighbourhood to consider opportunities to</td>
<td>Should the proposed neighbourhood area be agreed and the proposed forum be designated, the comments here will be sent to the forum for their consideration when preparing their neighbourhood plan. Lewisham’s Senior Conservation Officer has offered a response to Historic England’s representation: ’The Deptford Conservation Area has just undergone a review. It has highlighted the potential for including the mid 19th century terraces along New Cross Road between Florence Road and Watson’s Street in the east and the railway bridge/railway station to the west into the conservation area. From the conservation point of view it would be preferable to have this stretch of the southern side of New Cross Road included in order to ensure that policies are applied consistently for both sides of the street and for the small area that is within the Deptford High Street Conservation Area but currently not included in the neighbourhood plan.’ The Localism Act 2011 does not make provision for the Mayor to extend the boundary of the neighbourhood area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19     | Neutral        | TfL has no objection to the establishment of the Neighbourhood Forum in this area promoted by Deptford Neighbourhood Action. However, TfL notes that it has a significant amount of assets and operations within the proposed neighbourhood area including:  
  - The A2, New Cross/ Blackheath Roads, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) for which TfL are the highway authority;  
  - The Silwood Triangle Site, west of Trundley’s Road;  
  - Land adjacent to the East London Line, north of Edward Street;  
  - New Cross London Overground Station;  
  - Deptford Bridge DLR Station; and  
  - Deals Gateway Bus Stand.  

As indicated above, the area is served by London Overground and DLR services and infrastructure. In some areas this infrastructure (e.g. viaducts) have protection zones established around them which may limit some development. Further, 9 different bus services (47, 53, 177, 188, 199, 225, 453, N1 & N89) stops and stands operate within the proposed area. In addition, Cycle Superhighway 4 (Tower Bridge to Deptford) passes through the centre of the proposed neighbourhood area for which construction is scheduled to start in late 2016.  

TfL has an interest in facilitating the neighbourhood planning process... TfL would therefore like to take this opportunity to encourage the Forum to contact TfL throughout the development of any plans in order to assist in the development of policies... | No officer response required.  

Should the proposed neighbourhood area be agreed and the proposed forum be designated, the comments here will be sent to the forum for their consideration when preparing their neighbourhood plan. |
| 20     | Object to Forum| There are apprehensions regarding the formation of the DNA Neighbourhood Area for the following reasons:  
  - The proposal is not as well known about in the area or widely supported amongst... | DNA’s neighbourhood forum application states that the group have created a public website and Facebook page (which is linked to the Deptford Society’s... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep ID</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many active community groups already working hard locally to improve and represent the area</td>
<td>Facebook page), spoken at Ward Assembly meetings, spoken at community events and made contact with local community groups and held public meetings. The Council circulated leaflets advising on the applications within the Deptford area and a second round of consultation involved erecting posters in public places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very few of the active members of DNA are resident in SE8</td>
<td>A Local Authority has the power to withdraw a body’s designation if the terms of the constitution are not being met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The regulations only specify 21 residents are required. Proportionally against the number of residents in the area - within the high 100,000s this is laughable.</td>
<td>The Council has a neighbourhood planning web page and provided an explanation in the consultation materials. This is the early stage of neighbourhood plan preparation and there are more requirements to consult throughout the latter stages leading up to the referendum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The regulations around inclusion of volunteers from other areas can easily be manipulated to give outsiders more say and involvement than locals.</td>
<td>The requirement to hold a referendum and the rules which a referendum must meet are governed by legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A majority of DNA active members are active in other areas eg: in - Peckham, Nunhead, New Cross, Loughborough Junction - and are members of an alternative issue based community with their own agenda which is not Deptford locality specific.</td>
<td>The NPPG notes that Local Authorities should avoid pre-judging what may be contained in a neighbourhood plan when designating a neighbourhood area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Membership recruitment can meet qualifying regulations but still be contained and extraneous to the neighbourhood locality.</td>
<td>The regulations and procedures are designed by national Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is an easy opportunity for a clique to gain influence and funding for their own interests and agenda over long term local residents' needs and concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The council as the authority responsible for designation has not, to date, taken adequate proactive steps to explain the regulations and purpose of a Neighbourhood Area to the people it represents to enable them to make an informed vote in the Referendum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Referendum will entail a card being posted through the door as an election vote. People who feel negative about the proposal are most likely simply NOT to vote rather than vote negatively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of the residents voting in the Referendum does not have to be met So a vote of only 100 people voting yes versus 20 against would carry the yes - despite 100,0000s of abstentions on the matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abstentions in the Referendum are likely because residents do not understand what the issues or the procedures are or what DNA will actually be for other than a vague notion of a Neighbourhood Plan that is yet to be specified even in outline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People are being asked to vote for something that is not yet drafted in outline on the promise that it will be in their interests. Who is to say that DNA will only be looking out for their own interests ? Outlining the plan in advance would mean that work would not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be paid for as it is retrospective - which you would do if you cared genuinely for the area enough Although it could be DNA does have plans but do not want the rest of us to know what they are.</td>
<td>The consultation whilst directed at those that live and work in the proposed neighbourhood area, those outside can comment. Respondents are requested to provide their postcode for verification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The regulations and procedures attached to forming a Neighbourhood Area are complex and unfamiliar. The idea is in general perceived as a good one without anyone understanding fully how it works, who is accountable and at what stage grant money is allocated, overseen by, monitored or in whose bank account money allocated will be held.</td>
<td>The DNA Forum membership is open to anyone that lives, works or is an elected representative in the neighbourhood area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The 6 week consultation period is a matter simply of sending in an email of comments - without verification of identity or residency or a named council officer dealing with the application. to involve ordinary residents and long standing local pre-existing organisations because, basically, they do not know much about them or they don’t want them to interfere.</td>
<td>Grants are allocated by Locality from Central Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A lot of local people have not heard of or given much thought to DNA or what it is about or what statutory powers it will have.</td>
<td>The aims of the group are to promote the social, economic and environmental well being of the area as per the constitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long standing and community minded residents are aware that the current members of DNA have very little connection or knowledge across the board of the Deptford area or issues</td>
<td>Grants and any conditions that may be attached to the spending of monies are allocated by Locality from Central Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNA emerged as a way of temporary occupants of the Old Tidemill School on the brink of eviction trying to find a way of getting social housing and/or funding for their alternative projects. Enabling grants were made available via Locality to them straightaway and after that £8,000 with opportunities for further grant applications will be available to them. This could easily cause resentment and a sense of unfairness amongst genuine long term residents who have struggled for years to improve their area.</td>
<td>There is no legal requirement in the neighbourhood planning legislation to conduct a background check on Members for the proposed forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNA’s close links are with middle class alternative types who know how to work the system in their own favour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any planning involvement they may have will no doubt NOT focus on the long standing problems of the area but a project for housing themselves under the community sustainability banner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is hard not to believe that it is the money that is attracting this group rather their deep seated concern for Deptford - a place they in the main don’t know particularly well -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Neutral Environment Agency</td>
<td>That motivates them.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a lot of concern regarding what any grant monies awarded to them will be spent on and whether it will be used to replace funding lost to local art groups for community arts events rather than concentrating on bringing the community together to inform, enthuse and involve them in participating in local planning issues.</td>
<td>Should the proposed neighbourhood area be agreed and the proposed forum be designated, the full comments here will be sent to the forum for their consideration when preparing their neighbourhood plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Checks on the committee membership of DNA need to be explained or if none existent put into place. Particularly background checks on past criminal offenses relating to financial dealings, embezzlement, fraud, tax evasion etc..</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>It is not within our remit to comment on the proposed composition of the neighbourhood forum but we would wish to point out that the boundaries comprising the neighbourhood area front the river Thames. We would therefore wish to see the Deptford Neighbourhood Action Area aligning with the Environment Agency Thames Estuary 2100 (TE2100) Plan which was approved by DEFRA in November 2012.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA Area) cut across two boroughs and flood risk does not follow local authority boundaries. Planning for flood risk management in the Deptford Neighbourhood Action should reflect the plans of neighbouring Local Planning Authorities. Cross-boundary working should form part of work under the Duty to Co-operate. The provision of infrastructure for flood risk management is listed as one of the strategic priorities that should be considered in local plans (NPPF Paragraph 156). We would encourage the councils to work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual local plans (see NPPF paragraphs 178 and 179).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have attached below more detailed information for your consideration.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In response to the application: as a resident in the area I welcome the changes that have come to Deptford. I would like to lend support in principle to the proposed forum as this will be an important opportunity to have a say regarding local needs, as well as a means of sustaining rather than alienating communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re the proposed boundary, no objections to the extension to the creek. I also agree with the purpose and objectives as set out in the constitution.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23     | Neutral LFEPA  | We note that the proposed subject area for this Neighbourhood Forum, includes the following LFEPA (London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority) property:-  
- Deptford Fire Station, 186 Evelyn Street, SE8 5DB.  
Although we have no formal comment to make at this stage, we would be most grateful if you could keep us informed of all progress regarding this matter. | No officer response required.  
Should the proposed neighbourhood area be agreed and the proposed forum be designated, the comments here will be sent to the forum for their consideration when preparing their neighbourhood plan. |
| 24     | Support        | I received information about the Proposed DNA Neighbourhood Area and I do consider it a very interesting proposal, as that part of both boroughs seem to have its own identity, separate from the Deptford/Greenwhich location.  
Please keep me updated with any news regarding the proposal, as I am interested in following up its workings. I am an architect, with some training in urban planning, which makes it particularly interesting to me. | No officer response required.                                                                                                               |
<p>| 25     | General        | Little point. Lewisham does not consult it dictates local residents views count for nothing.                                                                                                              | No officer response required.                                                                                                               |
| 26     | Support Forum + Area | I should like to give my support to the establishment of a Deptford Forum with the boundaries to be set as shown on the map.                                                                                     | No officer response required                                                                                                               |
| 27     | Support Forum + Area | I live in Deptford, and confirm my interest and support for Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA) and their proposed Neighbourhood Plan and boundary.                                                                  | No officer response required                                                                                                               |
| 28     | Support Forum + Area | I am a full time resident living in Deptford, and confirm my interest and support for Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA) and their proposed Neighbourhood Plan and boundary.                                             | No officer response required                                                                                                               |
| 29     | Support Forum + Area | I am a person working and volunteering in Deptford, and confirm my interest and support for Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA) and their proposed Neighbourhood Plan and boundary.                                         | No officer response required                                                                                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep ID</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Support Forum</td>
<td>I am writing in support of DNA to say how much a Neighbourhood Forum is needed in Deptford and that as one of the volunteers working on this project I am keen to see DNA designated by the council and supported in it's aim to create a neighbourhood plan for the area.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Support Forum and Area</td>
<td>I very much support the application to form a Deptford Neighbourhood Forum.&lt;br&gt; I have lived in Deptford since ... 1981 and I come originally from a family...who have lived and worked in the district for centuries.&lt;br&gt; I have inspected the online documentation given on the Lewisham London Borough web site and it is my view that the riparian 'Deptford', as defined, is a wholly appropriate example of a distinct neighbourhood for the following reasons: It is a historic town with a distinct and internationally-known heritage. Were Deptford a similar settlement outside London it would probably be eligible to constitute itself as a civil parish 'town council', like Lewes, Stratford upon Avon, Berwick upon Tweed, etc. It has an economic, cultural and demographic character that distinguishes it sharply from the rest of the two London Boroughs within which it stands. With a population that is perceived as socially low-status, it has always been difficult for Deptford to make its voice heard above the clamour of private and public vested interests. The establishment of a Neighbourhood Forum would offer a platform for that voice to be heard more distinctly, as regards the development of the town. The communities that make up Deptford tend to be poor both in assets and cash, are often subject to great social pressures and stress and are hugely diverse in demography. A Neighbourhood Forum is certainly one important avenue through which can be focused a productive sense of communal unity.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>I'd like to record my support for DNA's Neighbourhood Area and Forum. I live just on the edge of the proposed Area and they have advertised their presence well, and seem competent to put together a Plan that could express what local people want.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>I am a person living in Deptford, and confirm my interest and support for Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA) and their proposed Neighbourhood Plan and boundary.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>I’d like to show my support for the proposed boundary and plan by Deptford Neighbourhood Action. I think that it is a worthwhile proposition especially as the scale and speed of developments are counter productive to people’s health at present, and a threat to the culture and communities of the area.</td>
<td>No officer response required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Support forum + area</td>
<td>I am a person living in Deptford, and confirm my interest and support for Deptford Neighbourhood Action (DNA) and their proposed Neighbourhood Plan and boundary. It is very important that we have this forum and I believe that it will grow and improve the area. I have recently heard that Southwark Council are building a tower block on the protected dock yard by our park. I was not informed of this and there are no notices or flyers up, we were not consulted at all. How can this happen? We need this forum.</td>
<td>Therefore, no officer response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
London Borough of Lewisham Neighbourhood Area Application

Name of proposed neighbourhood area

Deftord Neighbourhood Action (DNA Area)

Contact details
Please provide the name of your organisation, your full name, address, email address, telephone number. (REDACTED)

By submitting this form you are agreeing to make this information publicly available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Included (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A copy of the written constitution of the proposed forum.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An OS Map at a minimum of 1:10,000 scale showing the proposed neighbourhood area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A statement explaining how the proposed forum is established to promote or improve the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A statement explaining that membership is drawn from different places in the neighbourhood area, and from different sections of the community. The statement should explain that membership is open to those who live in the area, work in the area, or are elected members for the area. The statement should explain what steps have been taken in order to attempt to secure membership of individuals from different places in the area, and from different sections of the community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A list of at least 21 members of the proposed forum. For each member, please detail:  
  1. Their name  
  2. Their address  
  3. Their status: whether they area a resident in the area, a worker in the area, or an elected member for the area. | Yes            |
| A statement confirming that members of the proposed forum have all agreed to have their name and status published (their addresses will be redacted). | Yes            |
> A copy of the constitution is attached the Appendix 2
An OS Map at a minimum of 1:10,000 scale showing the proposed neighbourhood area.

Deptford Neighbourhood Action Area | DNA Area
> A statement explaining how the proposed forum is established to promote or improve the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area:

The purpose of DNA is to promote and improve the social, economic and environmental well-being of its residents and businesses. Our constitution states that our overarching objectives are: To encourage, empower and enable the involvement of all communities living and working in the defined neighbourhood area in the preparation, production and implementation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan which will aim to:

- **ENCOURAGE** community cohesion and active citizenship
- **IMPROVE** the health of the local community
- **SUPPORT** local businesses, organisations, industries and market traders
- **PROMOTE** and **DEVELOP** places for all creative communities to flourish
- **INCREASE** the provision of quality social and affordable housing for local people on low and middle incomes
- **PROMOTE** and **PROTECT** all forms of Deptford Heritage and Identities
- **AN IDENTITY FOR DEPTFORD**
- **PROTECT and MAXIMISE** the amount and quality of Green, Open and Public Spaces in the promotion of a healthier environment

> The statement should explain what steps have been taken in order to attempt to secure membership of individuals from different places in the area, and from different sections of the community:

As stated in our constitution DNA is open to all residents, workers and elected members in the plan area. In order to ensure that membership of the forum was diverse and reflected all parts of the area, we undertook the following measures:

- Organised three widely published community engagement events which, explained the concept and processes involved in producing a Neighbourhood Plan. We had support from our Locality Advisor.
- Set up a website page and facebook page to promote, explain and answer questions.
- Promoted the Forum and Plan at Ward assembly meetings, & the Evelyn Community event held on 18th June.
- Facilitated a press article on the front cover of South London Press.
- Spoke publicly at community events throughout April, May & June 2015 and will continue to do so.
- Made contact with local group, organisations and individuals throughout March, April, May & June 2015 and will continue to do so.

As stated in our attached constitution, membership is open to all people aged 16 years and over who meet any one of the following criteria, in that they:

- live in the neighbourhood area;
⇒ work in the local area either on a paid or voluntary basis;
⇒ are an elected Lewisham or Greenwich London Borough Council member representing a ward in the neighbourhood area;

“The Forum Committee members shall be drawn from different places in the neighbourhood area and different sections of the community. DNA shall have a minimum of 21 (twenty one) members, and the Forum Secretary shall maintain a register of members at all times and make it available to any DNA member or the public who requests it. Members will apply for membership and the Forum Committee shall have the power to accept members. Members of the Forum must be 16 (sixteen) years of age and over. Any DNA member may resign from membership by providing the Forum Committee Secretary with written notice. The Forum Committee may refuse membership, or may terminate or suspend the membership of any member by resolution passed at a Forum Committee meeting where it is considered membership would be detrimental to DNA's objectives and activities.”

⇒ A list of at least 21 members of the proposed forum. For each member, please detail:
The current DNA Membership is listed in Appendix 1.

⇒ Forum Member Information Statement
All current 39 members agree to have their names, street and status (live/work in the area) published by Lewisham Council. See Appendix 1.
Please return this form to with all the required attachments to:

John Miller
Head of Planning
London Borough of Lewisham
Laurence House
Catford
SE6 4RU

Alternatively, please email the completed form with all the required attachments, marked for the attention of John Miller, Head of Planning, to:

planning@lewisham.gov.uk
Appendix 1: Current DNA Membership

“39 names redacted on August 3 2017 owing to information received from an individual concerned that their name had been published without consent and that all the other redacted names may also have been published without consent but all the redacted names were available to members of the Mayor and Cabinet when the decision was taken”
1. NAME
Deptford Neighbourhood Action referred to elsewhere in this Constitution as “DNA”, is the name of our neighbourhood forum as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Localism Act 2011.

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA
The DNA neighbourhood area is shown on the attached map, referred to elsewhere in this constitution as the neighbourhood area. The DNA neighbourhood area falls within the boundaries of two London Boroughs, Lewisham & Greenwich.

3. PURPOSE and OBJECTIVES
The purpose of DNA is to promote and improve the social, economic and environmental well-being of its residents and businesses. Our overarching objectives of DNA are:
To encourage, empower and enable the involvement of all communities living and working in the defined neighbourhood area in the preparation, production and
implementation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan which will aim to:

**ENCourage** community cohesion and active citizenship

**IMPROve** the health of the local community  
**SUPPort** local businesses, organisations, industries and market traders

**PROMOTE and DEVELOP** places for all creative communities to flourish

**INCREASE** the provision of quality social and affordable housing for local people on low and middle incomes 
**PROMOTE and PROTECT** all forms of Deptford Heritage and Identities

4. **POWERS**

In furtherance of these overarching objectives the Forum Committee of DNA may exercise the power to:

- Invite and receive contributions and raise funds where appropriate, to finance its work
- and to open a bank account to manage such funds.
- Set up working groups with terms of reference to undertake tasks in furtherance of its objectives. All such working groups must include at least one management committee member.
- Publicise and promote the work of DNA and organise meetings, training courses, events or seminars relevant to its work.
- Work with groups of complementary nature and exchange information, advice and knowledge with them: including cooperation with other voluntary bodies; charities; statutory, and non-statutory organisations who want to affiliated with DNA; and elected members
- Employ staff (who shall not be members of the Management Committee) as necessary to conduct activities that meet the objectives of DNA.
- Take any lawful form of action which is necessary to achieve the overarching objectives of DNA, including taking out any contracts agreed by the Management Committee; for instance the acquisition of premises either short or long term.

5. **AFFILIATIONS**

The Forum shall not be affiliated to any political party.

6. **MEMBERSHIP**

Membership is open to all people aged 16 years and over who meet any one of the following criteria, in that they:

1. live in the neighbourhood area;
2. work in the local area either on a paid or voluntary basis;
3. are an elected Lewisham or Greenwich London Borough Council member representing a ward in the neighbourhood area;

The Forum Committee members shall be drawn from different places in the neighbourhood area and different sections of the community. DNA shall have a minimum of 21 (twenty one) members, and the Forum Secretary shall maintain a register of members at all times and make it available to any DNA member or the public who requests it. Members will apply for membership and the Forum Committee shall have the power to accept members. Members of the Forum must be 16 (sixteen) years of age and over.

Any DNA member may resign from membership by providing the Forum Committee Secretary with written notice.

The Forum Committee may refuse membership, or may terminate or suspend the
memberships of any member by resolution passed at a Forum Committee meeting where it is considered membership would be detrimental to DNA’s objectives and activities.

7. FORUM COMMITTEE

The DNA Forum Committee shall be elected at the DNA Annual General Meeting and shall consist of a minimum of 5 (five) members up to a maximum of 15 (fifteen). The quorum for the Committee will be 5 members.

DNA will elect the following officers of the Forum from its membership: Chair, Deputy Chair, Secretary, Treasurer and Media Officer and any other role that is deemed necessary. The general term of Office is 1 year.

The Chair of the Forum Committee shall be responsible for:
- Calling and chairing meetings of the D.N.A. Forum Committee, General Meetings and Annual General meetings of the D.N.A. membership (unless specifically delegated to another Forum Committee member in writing).
- Exercising a casting vote on elections and resolutions at meetings of the Forum and its Committee.
- Taking decisions on day-to-day matters between meetings of the Forum Committee after electronic consulting with other committee members.

The Deputy Chair shall be responsible for:
- Standing in for the Chair during any period of absence of the Chair due to holidays, illness or time away for personal reasons.

The Treasurer shall be responsible for:
- Establishing a DNA bank account and acting as a joint signatory on the account with one or more other member of the Forum Committee. Maintaining the DNA financial records.
- Setting out a draft budget in the first year, and ensuring that DNA stays within its budget
- Preparing and presenting an annual budget, at the DNA Annual General Meeting
- Submitting a detailed summary of all the DNA received and spent at every Committee meeting.

The Secretary shall be responsible for:
- Organising all DNA meeting dates, times and venues.
- Taking and circulating the minutes of all DNA meetings - making them available to all members.
- Maintaining a register of DNA and keeping a copy of the DNA Constitution for inspection by members of the public and DNA members.

The Media Officer shall be responsible for:
- Maintaining and updating the DNA website
- Preparing and presenting draft materials for the promotion of DNA through its organised events and activities, and for promotion in the neighbourhood area e.g. posters and leaflets.
- Actively encouraging promoting and advertising DNA via social media e.g. Twitter and Facebook.

All decisions at DNA meetings shall be made on a show of hands of members who are entitled to vote at the meeting.

a) General meetings

General Meetings of DNA members shall take place at least twice a year.

Notice and an agenda for a DNA General Meeting to DNA members shall be 14 (fourteen) days.

The quorum required for a General Meeting to conduct business shall be 5 (five) DNA members.

The Secretary will make minutes of the General and Committee meetings available to members of the Forum within two weeks of the meeting unless impracticable.
Organisations which are affiliated to DNA will be encouraged to communicate such information to their membership.

b) Annual General Meetings/Special Meetings
An Annual General Meeting of DNA members shall take place once in every calendar year. Notice and an agenda for an Annual General Meeting to DNA members shall be 21 (twenty-one) days. The quorum required for an Annual General Meeting to conduct business shall be 12 (twelve) DNA Members.

The Annual General meeting shall:

- Elect the DNA Forum Committee.
- Receive a report from the Forum Committee of the DNA activities that have taken place in that year.
- Receive a Financial report and statement from the Treasurer

Elections to the Forum Committee shall take place as follows:

a) DNA members shall notify the DNA Secretary of their intention to stand for a place on the Forum Committee in writing and at least 7 (seven) days before the Annual General Meeting takes place.

b) At the Annual General Meeting elections shall be held on the basis of a show of hands for each candidate.

Special Meetings may be called from time to time by the Forum Committee to consider amendments to the constitution or dissolution of the Forum. These shall be subject to the same notice and quorum as Annual General Meetings.

The Committee may co-opt up to three additional members to the Committee in any year, and may also co-opt an appropriate replacement for any Committee Member who stands down for any reason during the year. Co-opted members will have the same voting rights as other Committee members. A co-opted member may be elected as an officer. The Committee may remove from the Committee any member who fails to attend two consecutive meetings of the Committee without good reason.

8. DNA FINANCES
Any money acquired by DNA including donations, contributions and bequests, shall be paid into an account operated by the Forum Committee in the name of DNA Neighbourhood Forum.

All funds must be applied to the DNA objectives and for no other purpose.

Any deeds, cheques etc relating to DNA’s bank account shall be signed by at least 2 (two) Management Committee members, 1 (one) of whom must be the Treasurer.

Any income/expenditure shall be the responsibility of the Treasurer who will be accountable to ensure funds are utilised effectively and that the Forum stays within its budget.

Official accounts shall be maintained, and will be examined annually by an independent accountant who is not a member of the DNA. Forum.
An annual financial report shall be presented by the Treasurer at the DNA Annual General Meeting.

9. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
The Secretary will keep a Register of Committee members' Interests detailing financial interests in the neighbourhood area or any other interest which could be deemed to have an influence on decisions likely to come before the Forum Committee. Members will abstain from voting on any matter in which they have a financial interest.

Any participant in any meeting of the Forum, including committees, sub-committees and working parties, will disclose to the meeting any financial interest s/he has in any topic under discussion, and will not discuss or vote on such topic except with the express approval of the meeting.

12. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION
Any changes to this constitution must be agreed by a majority vote at a special general meeting, called specifically for the purpose under the same conditions that apply to Annual General Meetings specified above, with the exception that such a vote will only be carried if supported by 75% or more of those voting.

Proposed amendments to this Constitution of DNA must be conveyed to the Secretary formally in writing. The DNA Secretary and other DNA officers shall then decide whether to put the proposed amendments to a DNA special general meeting for discussion and decision.

13. DISSOLUTION
DNA may be dissolved if deemed necessary by the members in a majority vote at a special meeting, with the exception that such a vote will only be carried if supported by 75% or more of those voting.

Any assets or remaining funds after debts have been paid shall subject to the agreement of the Members at a General Meeting, be allocated to one or more nominated organisations set up to continue the work of DNA or in the absence of any such organisation and subject to any statutory regulations, be distributed equally to the constituent local organisations who are its members (but not to individual members).

In accordance with the Localism Act, a formal review of the functions and achievements of DNA will be carried out five years after its formation. Following such review, and consultation with its members, DNA will decide to continue, amend or dissolve itself as considered appropriate.

This constitution was adopted at the Inaugural Meeting of the Deptford Neighbourhood Action held at Deptford Lounge on 18th July 2015.

Signed
Andrea Hughes
Acting Chair
DNA Neighbourhood Area with borough boundary
Agenda Item 9

Chief Officer Confirmation of Report Submission
Cabinet Member Confirmation of Consultation

Report for:  Mayor
            Mayor and Cabinet
            Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)
            Executive Director

Information: Part 1  ✔  Part 2  ❌  Key Decision  ❌

Date of Meeting  17 February 2016

Title of Report  Response to the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the London Fire Brigade

Originator of Report  Geeta Subramaniam, Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People
                        Ext. 49569

At the time of submission for the Agenda, I confirm that the report has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Comments from Exec Director for Resources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Comments from the Head of Law</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Implications</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Implications</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Implications/Impact Assessment (as appropriate)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed Adherence to Budget &amp; Policy Framework</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment Comments (as appropriate)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Urgency (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed:  Executive Member
Date:    09.02.16

Signed:  Director/Head of Service
Date:    03.02.16

Control Record by Committee Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed on Schedule of Business/Forward Plan (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report Cleared at Agenda Planning Meeting (not delegated decisions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Report from CO Received by Committee Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Date for Call-in (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be Referred to Full Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Summary

1.1 This report provides a response following a referral to Mayor and Cabinet of the comments and views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 26 October 2015.

2. Recommendation

2.1 Overview and Scrutiny is recommended to note the responses.

3. Overview and Scrutiny Committee views

3.1 That Lewisham Council should carefully consider any proposals to permanently, or further, reduce fire cover within the London Borough of Lewisham.

Response:
The proposals outlined by the Fire and Emergency Planning Authority have been carefully considered with a motion being accepted at Council in January 2016 and further discussions at Safer Stronger Select Committee in January 2016. Please see Appendix A for details of the consultation and considerations given.

3.2 The Lewisham Council should make representations for full public consultation on any such proposals

Response:
A formal response has been made via the on-line consultation porthole by the Executive Cabinet Member for Community Safety as well as a direct letter from Lewisham’s Mayor and Cllr Janet Daby to the Fire Commissioner.

3.3 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee notes and agrees the following recommendations made by the Public Spending in Lewisham Working Group:

In 2014/15 and in 2015/16 (to date) the six minute target for getting a first appliance to an incident has not been met in the Bellingham, Downham and Grove Park wards of Lewisham. The LFB should focus its attention on understanding and addressing the reasons behind this failure. This should include considering any impact caused by the removal of Forest Hill’s second appliance and the closure of Downham Fire Station; and considering what mitigating action might be taken to improve attendance times in these areas. The findings should be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Response:
Such a review would be welcomed and anything that is identified will be considered by the Safer Lewisham Partnership and directly with the Borough’s Fire Commander.

4. Financial Implications
4.1 The changes outlined above are in relation to reduced resources within the Fire Service.

5. Legal Implications

5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to make recommendations to the Executive or appropriate committee and/or Council arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process.

6. Further Implications

6.1 At this stage there are no specific environmental, equalities or crime and disorder implications to consider, but any reductions in resources may impact on these areas and an assessment of impact will need to be considered.

Background papers

Response from Cabinet to matters referred by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee – London Fire Brigade – report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 26 October 2015

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney, Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People on 020 8314 9569.
Appendix A

Overview

The Mayor of London is proposing to provide funding of £382.4m for the London Fire and
Emergency Planning Authority in 2016/17, subject to the grant provided by central government for
the fire service for next year which is still unknown. £382.4m funding will require savings of
£11.5m to be made. The current consultation seeks views on two different options that have been
put forward to help inform the decision on how those budget savings will be made.

In 2013, London Fire Brigade consulted on the Draft Fifth London Safety Plan (LSP5) which set out
how the fire and rescue service in London could be delivered. Following the consultation, changes
were made to the draft plan and the Fifth London Safety Plan, as amended, was approved by the
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority in September 2013. While the Brigade has not
previously consulted on meeting the budget, it is doing so on this occasion as the options propose
operational changes to the service.

There will be a full public consultation on the Sixth London Safety Plan (LSP6) in 2016 in order to
seek views on how the fire and rescue service could be delivered in the years ahead.

Balancing the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority budget for 2016/17

There is a requirement for savings of £11.5m to be made to the London Fire and Emergency Planning
Authority budget in 2016/17.

Over a third of the savings required (£5.1m) will come through departmental and efficiency savings
which have already been agreed. There are five voluntary redundancies from non-uniformed staff
arising from these savings and four operational posts will be replaced with four new non-
operational posts, although no operational staff will be made redundant. For the remaining £6.4m,
there are two options set out in this consultation document on which views are being sought.

Neither of the options include closing fire stations or require compulsory redundancies for
operational staff. Both options result in a reduction in the number of operational staff which would
be achieved by not replacing staff who have retired or left the service for other reasons.

Background – fire and other incidents in London

Although the number of fires is at its lowest level since records began.

The number of fire deaths in London has been falling steadily since the late 1980s. In 1987, there
were 28.5 fire deaths per million of the resident population compared to just 3.4 per million in
2014. In 2014/15, the number of calls received by the Brigade and incidents attended has
continued to fall. Comparing 2011/12 and 2014/15:

- emergency calls received – down by 18 per cent or 38,300 fewer
- all incidents attended – down by 18 per cent or 20,800 fewer
- primary (more serious) fires – down by 15 per cent or 2,000 fewer
- secondary (smaller) fires – down by 37 per cent or 5,300 fewer
- shut in lift releases – down by 37 per cent or 2,800 fewer
- false alarms due to automatic fire alarm – down by 15 per cent or 6,100 fewer

Background – the 13 fire engines

Page 445
There are currently 13 fire engines which have been held back from day-to-day deployment since August 2013. They were part of a contingency service of 27 fire engines ready in the event of strike action arising from the FBU’s national dispute on fire service pensions. All 27 were removed from stations that had two fire engines, so no fire stations were closed as a result.

As a result of changes made last year, there are 13 fire stations that continue to have one of their two fire engines removed. They are: Chelsea, Ealing, Erith, Forest Hill, Holloway, Old Kent Road, Plaistow, Poplar, Romford, Shoreditch, Stratford, Wandsworth and Willesden.

The main difference between the two options put forward in this consultation is around these engines. For both options, it is noted that no borough where average fire engine attendance performance is currently within the London-wide target will go out of target and no borough where performance is currently outside of the London-wide target will get worse.

**Option A**

Option A is the option preferred by the majority of the members of the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. It recommends putting the 13 fire engines back into service but making savings by establishing alternate crewing at stations with some special appliances. Alternate crewing means that in stations where there is a fire engine and a special appliance there would be one crew for both appliances. This option would see two fire rescue units (FRUs), five aerial appliances and two operational support units (OSUs) being alternate crewed.

Decisions about which special appliances to alternate crew have been based on those which deliver the greatest volume of alternate crewing possible in the shortest period of time. There would be some differences in the vehicles chosen, depending on whether the aim were to optimise the attendance times of fire engines or optimise the attendance times of the special appliances. The difference in the impact on fire engine response times is minimal – no more than a one second increase on London-wide average first and second fire engine attendance times. The differences in the impacts on the London-wide attendance times of the special appliances is no more than 41 seconds in each case. Optimisation of alternate crewing could be considered in 2016 as part of the Sixth London Safety Plan. The detail can be seen at Appendix 3 of the Supplementary report to the Budget Update for Authority (FEP2520A).

**Impact on posts**

The option would not result in station closures.

The option would not result in compulsory redundancies for operational staff. There would be a reduction of 124 operational posts which would be managed through the natural turnover of staff.

This option is likely to result in a reduction in a small number of posts which may result in redundancies of non-operational staff. For more information see the Equality Analysis.

**Impact on balancing the budget**

This option would achieve a balanced budget with a requirement for a one-off draw on the general reserve of £1.24m in 2016/17.

**Impact on attendance times (see appendix A)**

The Brigade has continued to meet its London-wide average attendance time target of six minutes for a first fire engine and eight minutes for a second while the 13 fire engines have been out of service. If the 13 fire engines were returned to service, it is believed (based on modelled results) that this would improve average London-wide attendance times by around four seconds for the first
fire engine (from 5mins 27secs to 5min 23secs) and by around 18 seconds for the second fire engine (from 6mins 45secs to 6mins 27secs).

By its nature, alternate crewing can impact attendance times for fire engines and for special appliances. Officers have used modelling to look at those impacts. This showed that:

- There are minimal impacts on London-wide average first and second fire engine attendance times – no more than a one second increase in any case. The detail can be seen at appendix 2 of the Appointments and Urgency Committee report on budget consultation (FEP2548).

- There are more significant impacts on the attendance times of the special appliances – with London-wide average increases of between five seconds and one minute ten seconds for the different sorts of special appliances. The detail can be seen at appendix 2 of the Appointments and Urgency Committee report on budget consultation (FEP2548).

Option B

Option B is the option recommended by the Commissioner of London Fire Brigade. It recommends the permanent removal of the 13 fire engines and reinvesting some of the savings from that into increasing the number of staff available to crew fire rescue units by adding a Watch Manager (A) role on each watch at each station with a fire rescue unit. The detail can be seen at paragraph 45 - 47 of Budget Update for the Resources Committee (FEP2520).

Decisions about which fire stations the 13 fire engines came from were based on modelling carried out in 2013 which showed where their removal would have the least impact on emergency response targets. Current incident distribution and demand means the modelling would now give a different list of fire engines which could be removed. The difference in the impact on response times between the two lists is minimal – no more than a one second increase on London-wide average first and second fire engine attendance times. Optimisation of the distribution of all the fire engines in London will be considered in 2016 as part of the Sixth London Safety Plan. The detail can be seen at Appendix 9 of Budget Update for the Resources Committee (FEP2520).

Impact on posts

The option would not result in station closures.

The option would not result in compulsory redundancies. This would mean an overall reduction of 188 operational posts which would be managed through the natural turnover of staff. For more information see the Equality Analysis.

Impact on balancing the budget

If the 13 engines were to be removed on a permanent basis, £11.8m in savings would be made – £3.5m would be reinvested in increasing the establishment at fire rescue unit stations by adding a watch manager (A) role on each watch.

This option would result in a balanced budget with a budget surplus of £1.7m in 2016/17. Decisions about how this surplus is used would be made once the grant provided by central government for the fire service for next year is known.

Impact on attendance times (see Appendix A)

The Brigade has continued to meet its London-wide average attendance time target of six minutes for a first fire engine and eight minutes for a second while the 13 fire engines have been out of service. If the 13 fire engines were returned to service, it is believed (based on modelled results)
that this would improve average London-wide attendance times by around four seconds for the first fire engine (from 5mins 27secs to 5min 23secs) and by around 18 seconds for the second fire engine (from 6mins 45secs to 6mins 27secs).

There would be no impact on attendance times of special appliances.

The detailed impacts can be seen at Annex 3A, 3B and Annex 5 to Appendix 9 of the Resources Committee report (FEP2520).
Dear Gareth Bacon AM

I am writing to formally register Lewisham's position in relation to the London Fire Service Consultation. Whilst we completely understand and recognise the significant financial position the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority is in, we also have significant concerns about the impact on the safety of our residents if the appliances that have been removed for the past 2 years are not returned.

Lewisham Council has undertaken a detailed review of emergency services and has noted in the Public Spending report of 2015 the absence of Forest Hill's second appliance has had a negative impact on the time taken for both the first and second fire crews to arrive across Lewisham.

Since the implementation of Fifth London Safety Plan in 2014 and the closure of Downham fire station the most recent data shows:

- that on average the borough has seen an increase of over half a minute in the arrival of the first fire engine at an incident. This has gone up from 4 minutes 45 seconds in 2012/13 to 5 minutes 18 seconds in 2014/15 an increase of 33 seconds.
- The borough has seen an increase of 41 seconds for the arrival of the second fire engine; this has gone up from 6 minutes 23 seconds in 2012/13 to 7 minutes 4 seconds in 2014/15.
- Bellingham and Crofton Park wards have seen increases of over half a minute for the arrival of the first fire engine at an incident.
- Crofton Park, Forest Hill, Perry Vale and Rushey Green wards have all seen increases of over 1 minute for the second crew to arrive, residents of Perry Vale ward are on average having to wait 2 minutes 48 seconds longer for back up crews to arrive.
- The removal of the fire engine from Forest Hill would also impact on 3 wards in LB Southwark, East Dulwich and Village wards are having to wait over a minute longer for the second fire engine

Lewisham Council believes that the permanent removal of a fire appliance will only lead to further deterioration in arrival times. It is for this reason that the Council supports Option A.

I look forward to hearing from you and happy to meet to discuss the concerns in Lewisham to assist in any decisions being taken.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Janet Daby
Cabinet Member for Community Safety
London Borough of Lewisham
At the time of submission for the Agenda, I confirm that the report has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Comments from Exec Director for Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Comments from the Head of Law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Disorder Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Implications/Impact Assessment (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed Adherence to Budget &amp; Policy Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment Comments (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Urgency (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: [Signature]  Executive Member
Date: 09/02/2016

Signed: [Signature]  Director/Head of Service
Date: 9/2/2016
1. Summary

1.1 On 26 October 2015 the Overview and Scrutiny Committee discussed the prospects, opportunities and challenges of devolution.

1.2 The OS Committee made recommendations, and on 11 November, the Mayor was asked to agree that the Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration should provide a response to the Committee’s recommendation. This report sets out the proposed response.

2. Recommendations

The Mayor is recommended to:

2.1 Note the policy context for devolution in England and the background to the London devolution discussions and

2.2 Agree that the response is to be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

3. Background and policy context

3.1 Following the ‘no’ vote in the September 2014 Scottish independence referendum, the Government announced that:

‘It is also important we have wider civic engagement about how to improve governance in our United Kingdom, including how to empower our great cities — and we will say more about this in the coming days.’

3.2 This followed the production of several reports during 2014 making proposals for the transfer of additional powers to local authorities, or to local areas. These built upon the 2012 report No Stone Unturned: in Pursuit of Growth, which recommended the merging of various funding streams to provide much greater local responsibility for economic development. Public service reform and service efficiency triggered by continuing reductions in local government funding, is also prioritised within the more recent reports. Changes proposed include:

• Giving new powers in specific policy areas to local authorities;
• The transfer of additional budgets alongside those powers;
• Enhanced power over local taxes (council tax and business rates), additional local taxation powers, and more flexibility around borrowing and financial management;
• The creation of combined authorities and/or directly-elected mayors.

3.3 The first ‘devolution deal’ was announced by the Government and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority in November 2014. In advance of the 2015 general election, further deals followed with Sheffield (December 2014) and West Yorkshire (March 2015).

3.4 Since then, devolution deals with eight areas have been agreed (Sheffield city region, West Yorkshire, Cornwall, North East, Tees Valley, West Midlands, Liverpool City Region, and North Midlands deal is agreed in draft. Discussions have also taken place on further devolution to Greater London.

3.5 The devolution agenda is about devolving additional powers and funding streams to city regions and groups of authorities in combined authorities on the basis that a new governance structure of Elected Mayor of the combined authority will be created. Devolution is not being applied to individual local authorities. The following table identifies the powers devolved under each of the deals.
3.6 The devolution deals agreed in Sheffield, Liverpool, North-East, Tees Valley, and the West Midlands (and the draft North Midlands deal) have many similarities in terms of powers to be devolved. They include the following:

**Restructuring the further education system.** This typically consists of local commissioning of the Adult Skills Budget from 2016-17, followed by full devolution of the budget from 2018-19. Areas will be required to undertake a full review of further education and skills provision, and to have agreed arrangements with the Government for managing financial risk. Some areas will also take on the Apprenticeship Grant for Employers.

London already has this agreed (on the same timescale), with devolution to the London Enterprise Panel and the GLA. The Area review process was announced in the Budget 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further education and skills</th>
<th>Greater Manchester</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
<th>North-East</th>
<th>Tees Valley</th>
<th>Liverpool</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>Cornwall</th>
<th>West Yorks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign post-16 FE system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship Grant for Employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Skills funding by 2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devolved, consolidated transport budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus franchising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint working with Highways England and Network Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local roads network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart ticketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Hub to align local and national business support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint working with UKTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devolved approach to business support services from 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint commissioning of support for harder to help claimants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible full joint commissioning from 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Loan Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory purchase orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoral Development Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning call-in powers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory spatial strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission / business plan for integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor to become Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor to take over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU structural funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment fund (per year)</td>
<td>£30m</td>
<td>£30m</td>
<td>£30m</td>
<td>£15m</td>
<td>£30m</td>
<td>£36.5m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single funding pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of 100% business rates growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Business support.** In most areas, local and central business support services will be united in a ‘growth hub’. UK Trade and Investment will be required to partner with local business support services. Many deals have agreed a “devolved approach” to business support services from 2017.

This is already a GLA function.

**The Work Programme.** This is the Government’s main welfare-to-work programme. Unemployed people claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) or Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) are referred on to the programme from their local Jobcentre Plus, and remain on the programme for up to two years. The scheme is run by providers who have the freedom to introduce and implement their own ideas and schemes to help unemployed participants find work. Providers are paid by results. Many areas are to jointly develop a programme for ‘harder-to-help’ benefit claimants.

The GLA and London Councils are negotiating this in London.

**EU structural funds.** A number of areas are to become ‘intermediate bodies’, which means that they, instead of the Government, will be able to take decisions about which public and private bodies to give EU structural funds to. Local areas will be able to link these funding decisions to investment decisions they make in other devolved areas, such as further education and business support, provided their decisions remain within the terms of the EU structural funding agreement.

GLA is already an intermediary body.

**Fiscal powers.** Many deals include an investment fund, often of £30 million per year. The division of this fund into capital and revenue elements varies between areas. The power to retain 100% of business rates growth also appears in a number of deals. Elected mayors will have the power to add a supplement of up to 2p on business rates, with the agreement of the relevant Local Enterprise Partnership. Some areas will also receive a Housing Investment Fund.

GLA have made many proposals in the past and Government has changed the local government finance system to one based upon need to a business rate funded system. GLA has agreed two Growth deals with Government to fund economic development activity.

**Integrated transport systems.** Many deals include the power to introduce bus franchising, which would allow local areas to determine their bus route networks and to let franchises to private bus companies for operating services on those networks.

London already has transport powers and has been granted further powers over the rail network in London.

**Planning and land use.** Many deals include the power to create a spatial plan for the area, and/or the power to establish Mayoral Development Corporations. Non-statutory joint bodies (‘Land Commissions’ or ‘Joint Asset Boards’) will be established to improve the management of surplus land and buildings across
public sector bodies, making joint decisions on whether to re-use, share, or sell unused land and buildings within the public estate.

All of these powers is available in Greater London including the Land Commission.

3.7 It is clear that London already has many of the powers contained within devolution deals in other places. This is devolution to the London Mayor and the Greater London Authority. London Boroughs have been working through London Councils with the GLA on developing propositions for how the whole of London Government might work together on joint service proposals.

3.8 The London boroughs, together with the GLA, have put forward a number of propositions for sub-regional devolution within London. London Councils worked with the GLA to produce a ‘London proposition’ as the basis for devolution negotiations over the summer of 2015. This high level set of negotiating aims/ambitions was agreed by London Councils/GLA. The focus of the London proposition was a broad negotiating position on employment, skills, business support, crime and justice, health and housing. The proposition also proposed a governance mechanism of the ‘London Congress’ - London Councils Executive or all Leaders/ Mayors with the Mayor of London.

3.9 Discussions on the propositions have been on-going. In December 2015 the Government agreed a series of pilots around health and social care collaboration with groups of London boroughs, in partnership with the Greater London Authority (GLA) and London CCGs. The London Health and Care Collaboration Agreement is a collaborative statement on joint working regarding health and care services. In London, a joint London Health Board is to supervise five pilot schemes for the integration of health and care. The pilots will focus on local integration of services, and will explore if the barriers that make integration difficult can be eased or removed by rule changes or reduction of restrictions. They will enable a potential devolution proposition to be developed (i.e. what do you need to change, what powers might be needed) but they are not in themselves pilots testing any devolution of resources or powers. Any decisions on service integration will go through the existing Governance arrangements, individual Borough Health and Wellbeing Boards.

3.10 This is the same as health and social care devolution in Greater Manchester. At local (borough) level, Health and Wellbeing Boards, made up of representatives from CCGs and boroughs, will ensure that health and social care services are provided in a joined-up fashion, in line with the new Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership Board Strategic Sustainability Plan. The proposals will not lead to a wholesale transfer of functions or funds from the NHS to local authorities, or vice versa. Chris Ham, chief executive of the Kings Fund, stated:

“Devolution to Greater Manchester should enable decisions to be taken much closer to the population being served, with councillors having a bigger influence on future decisions. ...The unanswered question is how much freedom public sector leaders will have to depart from national policies in taking greater control of NHS resources.”
3.11 The GM proposals are to be implemented via section 75 of the National Health Service Act 2006, which permits agreements to share functions and budgets between NHS bodies and local authorities, not via the provisions of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill. The Greater Manchester Mayor will not have any executive or budgetary control over the integration of health and social care. The Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership Board will appoint its own chief executive and staff team.

3.12 In November 2015, a joint document produced by the London Mayor, London Councils, and the London Local Enterprise Panel, entitled high-level outcomes sought for the skills system in London by 2020, and set out a prospectus for devolving power in order to achieve them:

- Devolution of the Adult Skills Budget, Adult Community Learning, and discretionary support for 19+ learners;
- Devolution of London’s share of advanced learning loans;
- A guaranteed ‘proportionate return’ to London from the apprenticeships levy introduced at the 2015 Spending Review;
- Transfer of the Secretary of State’s appointment powers over college boards;
- Protection of London’s share of 16-19 skills funding;
- Creation of a Skills Commissioner for London.

All these powers would be held by the Mayor of London and GLA.

3.13 The area review process of FE and adult learning is being lead in London by the London Mayor, GLA and LEP. A sub-regional approach has been adopted and the review of the central region, of which Lewisham is part, is being lead by Cllr Peter John, Leader of Southwark and representative on the London LEP. A briefing is going to all members on the up-coming area review of FE and adult learning.

3.13 Co-commissioning of parts of the Health and Work Programme in London was agreed in the Spending review 2015, and a proposal is being developed. The GLA and London Councils are negotiating this as part of the ‘London proposition’ using the Lewisham Lambeth and Southwark employment offer as a model of local service delivery. In the negotiation it is expected that sub regional groupings in London will act together to co-commission the new Work and Health programme at a more local level than the current two package areas in London.

4. Response to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on devolution

4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee resolved to advise the Mayor and Cabinet of the following:

Point One

In February 2015 the Council agreed a motion expressing its support for the Core Cities’ Modern Charter for Local Freedom; and agreed to campaign for further devolution and greater localism and a fairer distribution of resources based on the restoration of needs-based central funding. However, the Overview and
Scrutiny Committee would like to be reassured that this is not used as a mechanism to implement more HM Treasury top sliced cuts. It would also like to endorse the recommendation of the Public Spending Working Group that:

*If proposals for devolution in London are accepted by the Government, the Mayor and Executive Members should share their proposals with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as soon as possible to facilitate constructive scrutiny and the most effective constitutional arrangements*

…to ensure we have transparency and accountability in any arrangements.

The response:

The campaign for greater local control and devolution of services has been long running, and seen a variety of Government initiatives under various Governments including Total Place and Whole Place Community Budgets. Evidence of the better efficiency of local integrated services has been provided to Government from such initiatives. The Council of 27th November 2013 agreed a motion to support the Local Government Association’s Rewiring Public Services campaign, which embodies these objectives:

- To ask the borough’s Members of Parliament to support the Rewiring Public Services campaign to improve local voters’ influence over services, tax and spending; and
- To make the council’s position clear to the Secretary of State.”

The motion stated that Council considers:

- That the likely scale of change in how public services are funded and provided makes it democratically unsustainable for those changes to be decided within the existing over-centralised model;
- That services need to be reformed and integrated across local agencies to enable them to prevent problems rather than picking up the pieces;
- That voters should be given back a meaningful say on a wider range of tax and spending decisions, through place-based budgetary arrangements and the reinstatement of fair financial distribution agreed among English councils, the re-creation of a municipal bond market, and the certainty of multi-year funding settlements for the life of a Parliament;

- That central government should enable that local decision-making by joining up and reducing in size Whitehall departments in order to facilitate local place-based budgets, by reducing Ministers’ powers to intervene in local decisions, and replacing bureaucratic tick-box inspection regimes with local service users champions; and
- That such a new more mature settlement between central and local government should be put beyond future revision by giving formal constitutional protection to local democracy.

The devolution of powers to City Regions is important in helping deliver the ambition of the motion and in London this will be achieved through the GLA and
through London Councils acting for individual and groups of Boroughs in the London-wide negotiation. At the point where a proposal is accepted by Government, these will be submitted to scrutiny in the normal way.

In its response to the recommendation of the Public Spending Working Group, on 9 January 2016 the Mayor agreed the following response:

“Should proposals for devolution in London be accepted by the Government, the Council will prepare analysis of the implications risks and changes for the London Borough of Lewisham and submit these for scrutiny and decision in the usual way.”

Given the complexity of the issues involved and the negotiations, a wider discussion amongst members of the expectations and ambitions of devolution (or wider public sector reform) would be useful to develop a deeper and meaningful debate.

**Point Two**

It also endorses the recommendation of the Public Spending Working Group that:

*The formal partnership arrangements between the Mayor, Executive Members and Officers should be reviewed to ensure that they are robust enough to recognise the potential conflicts and solutions required to address the scale of the challenges this review [the Public Spending in Lewisham Review] has identified.*

The response:

In its response to the recommendation of the Working Group, on the 9th January 2016 the Mayor agreed the following response:

“This is a challenge recognised by the Mayor, Executive Member and Officers. Namely that, whether as a result of financial constraint or policy choice, services are being reconfigured across London through the existing governance models. The operation and ways of working of the two statutory partnership boards, the Health and Well-being Board and the Safer Lewisham Partnership are reviewed on a regular basis.

Although formal partnership boards, neither are decision-making. Decision-making powers rest with the individual bodies that make up the partnerships, and so the Partnerships are able to make recommendations or develop proposals back though the existing governance of each body. This is an area that is kept under review and the governance arrangements assessed as and when plans – be they for spending reduction, devolution, public sector integration, or shared services-are agreed.”

5. **Legal implications**

There are no specific legal implications.
6. **Financial implications**
   
   There are no financial implications.

7. **Equalities implications**
   
   There are no equalities implications.

8. **Crime and disorder implications**
   
   There are no crime and disorder implications.

9. **Environmental implications**
   
   There are no environmental implications.

10. **Background Documents and Report Author**

    GLA/ London Councils, 2015 The London Proposition  
    HMT Budget 2015  
    HMT Spending Review 2015/6

    Report author: Robyn Fairman, Head of Strategy, 0208 3146335
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1. **Purpose of the report**

To inform Mayor and Cabinet about the new Housing Zone opportunity, and to seek approval to submit a bid for the Catford regeneration programme for consideration by the GLA.

2. **Summary**

An opportunity has arisen for the Council to seek substantial support towards the regeneration of Catford. The GLA’s Housing Zones are an initiative which support development schemes that have the potential to deliver large amounts of housing (in excess of 1,000 dwellings) in order to meet the significant demand for homes in London.

3. **Recommendation**

3.1 The Mayor is recommended to approve the submission of a bid for a Catford Housing Zone to the GLA.

4. **Policy Context**

4.1 'People, prosperity, place', Lewisham's regeneration strategy 2008-2020, sets out the Council's aspiration for a vibrant, dynamic Lewisham focussed around the themes of people - investing in the individuals and communities which are Lewisham’s greatest asset - prosperity - fostering the skills and economic opportunities for Lewisham to flourish and thrive - and place - developing high quality public spaces, sustainable buildings and protecting the areas which are sensitive to change. The strategy identifies the Catford town centre as a strategic site with the Borough. The strategy is also placed within the framework of the key national and regional policies which affect the Council’s work around regeneration of the borough, including the London Plan.

4.2 'Shaping our future', Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 - 2020, includes the 'Dynamic and Prosperous' theme, where people are part of
vibrant communities and town centres, well connected to London and beyond. It details the Local Strategic Partnership's commitment to 'improving the quality and vitality of Lewisham's town centres and localities', and aspirations to 'support the growth and development of our town centres by working with commercial partners and developers', and 'maximise the use of our town centres as places to engage the local community'.

4.3 Shaping our future' identifies 'Active healthy citizens as a key priority – where the Council are committed to ensuring that people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being, supported by high quality health and care services, leisure, culture and recreational activities'.

4.4 Strengthening the local economy is a corporate priority, emphasising the importance of 'gaining resources to regenerate key localities, strengthen employment skills and promote public transport.

4.5 The Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) sets the vision, objectives, strategy and policies that will guide development and regeneration in the borough up to 2025 and together with the Mayor of London's 'London Plan' will form the statutory development plan for the borough.

4.6 Lewisham’s Housing Strategy 2015–2020 sets out four key objectives:

- Helping residents at times of severe and urgent housing need
- Building the homes our residents need
- Greater security and quality for private renters
- Promoting health and wellbeing by improving our residents' homes

5. Background

5.1 In August 2014 the Department for Communities & Local Government (DCLG) and the GLA announced their plans to create twenty ‘Housing Zones’ across the capital. The aim of Housing Zone designation is to boost housing supply in London by unlocking and accelerating housing delivery through a range of planning and financial measures. Local authorities were offered the opportunity to submit bids, either independently or in collaboration with private sector partners.

5.2 The Government and the GLA have jointly committed a total of £400m towards the first twenty zones. Funding was available in a variety of forms including loans and flexible funding forms, including grant funding. The Housing Zone process seeks to encourage co-operation between local authorities, central government and developers. The process provides that, regardless of the source of funding, applications for designation should be submitted by Local Authorities.

5.3 New homes developed in Housing Zones are expected to be geared towards meeting a range of housing needs and to address the affordability challenge currently facing many Londoners. This requires a mix of open market homes that are affordable for Londoners with an obligation, where possible, to prioritise the sale of individual homes to Londoners.
purchasing for owner-occupation. It also includes new long term market rent homes, as well as affordable homes for rent and low cost home ownership.

5.4 The GLA identified Opportunity Areas as ‘ideal candidates’ for Housing Zone designation. Opportunity areas are often (but not always) places with relatively low land values, sometimes with an historic industrial use, and are usually characterised by some form of market failure that requires substantial intervention. Whilst identified as challenging they can provide opportunities for the public and private sector working collaboratively to regenerate areas and create new neighbourhoods and places. It is envisaged that through Housing Zone designation some of these more challenging areas could be addressed, unlocking schemes and accelerating the delivery of the planned housing.

5.5 Following the announcement of all 20 Housing Zones under the initial scheme in October 2015 the Mayor of London announced an intention to create a further 10 Housing Zones by the end of March 2016.

5.6 Lewisham officers met with GLA and TfL officers in December 2015 to discuss key issues surrounding the regeneration of Catford town centre. The latest phase of work has highlighted the potential of Catford town centre to contribute towards the delivery of new homes and to bring about much needed investment in improvements to the town centre’s retail and leisure offer, transport and public realm. However, scheme finances are stretched and securing all our priorities within the area is a challenge.

5.7 As Housing Zone funding is designed to accelerate and enable the delivery of new homes, the Catford scheme is a good candidate for support as it is felt that the scheme could deliver the 1,000+ homes required by the Housing Zone’s 2026 deadline. Officers have had discussions with the GLA about the nature of support that would be most beneficial and grant funding to support the delivery of affordable housing together with some enabling infrastructure works appears to be a best fit with the scheme objectives.

5.8 An announcement on funding is expected in March 2016 and if the Council is successful a report will be prepared for Mayor & Cabinet providing details of any award and of any terms that require negotiation thereafter.

6. Financial Implications

6.1 Mayor & Cabinet approval is required to submit the bid for Housing Zone funding, because the potential funding award exceeds £1 million. The GLA has confirmed that total funding of £200m has been committed towards 10 further Housing Zones.

7. Legal implications

7.1 In accordance with the Mayoral Scheme of Delegation, approval of any application for external funding exceeding £1 million is reserved to the Mayor.
7.2 At this stage, the Council is simply submitting a bid. The details of any award of funding and any terms attached to the funding will be reported back to Mayor & Cabinet for approval.

8. Risk Assessment

8.1 If successful the Council will be required to enter into a funding agreement with the GLA in respect of any funding award. The details of any terms offered including risk and reward to the scheme will be considered and reported to Mayor & Cabinet for approval prior to entering into any funding agreement.

9. Equality Implications

9.1 There are no immediate equality implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

10. Environmental Implications

10.1 There are no immediate environmental implications associated with the recommendations of this report

11. Crime and disorder implications

11.1 There are no immediate crime & disorder implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

12. Conclusion

12.1 Mayor & Cabinet are recommended to consider the current opportunity to secure Housing Zone support towards the delivery of the Catford regeneration programme and to agree to the submission of a bid for support from the GLA. External support, particularly in the form of grant funding would have a substantial benefit to the deliverability of the Catford programme and to the outcomes which the scheme can achieve.

13. Report originator

13.1 If there are any queries on this report please contact Gavin Plaskitt, Senior Programme Manager on 020 8314 6398.
1. **Summary**

1.1 This report informs the Mayor and Cabinet of the comments and views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee, arising from discussions held on the Catford Regeneration Review, considered at its meeting on 14 January 2016.

2. **Recommendation**

2.1 Mayor and Cabinet is recommended to note the views of the Sustainable Development Select Committee as set out in this report.

3. **Sustainable Development Select Committee’s views**

3.1 On 14 January 2016, the Sustainable Development Select Committee considered evidence as part of its in-depth review on the Catford Regeneration Programme.

3.2 The Committee resolved to advise Mayor and Cabinet of the following:

- That the Committee felt it was unfortunate that the options presented meant that it appeared that the Council was being offered a choice between additional housing verses smoother traffic flow and possibly better pedestrian provision.

- That the Committee stressed the importance of making a decision on an option for the Catford Town Centre and noted that historic indecision was the major barrier to development of the area.

3.3 The Select Committee recommended that:

- Any Option selected should be fully integrated including ensuring a thorough and well thought-out offer to enhance the street-scene for pedestrians.

- The Mayor lobby Network Rail to prioritise improving the rail-over-road bridge on Catford Road to allow for better pedestrian and cycling provision.

- That the presentation by Ian Chalk from Ian Chalk Architects be referred for information and consideration by Mayor and Cabinet and to the Broadway Theatre Working Party Group for consideration.
4. Financial implications

4.1 There are no financial implications arising out of this report per se; but there may financial implications arising from carrying out the action proposed by the Committee.

5. Legal implications

5.1 The Constitution provides for Select Committees to refer reports to the Mayor and Cabinet, who are obliged to consider the report and the proposed response from the relevant Executive Director; and report back to the Committee within two months (not including recess).

6. Further implications

6.1 At this stage there are no specific environmental, equalities or crime and disorder implications to consider. However, there may be implications arising from the implementation of the Committee’s recommendations.

Background papers

Report to Sustainable Development Select Committee, 14 January 2016, Item 4: Catford Regeneration Programme Review

If you have any queries on this report, please contact Katie Wood, Scrutiny Manager (0208 3149446).
Jan 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

Broadway Theatre, Catford

The enclosed pages are a record of the presentation to the Sustainability Development Committee at Lewisham Civic Suite on Thursday 14th January 2016.

The content is an edited extract of a feasibility study which was generated over the past 10 months.

The report describes a collection of thoughts for refurbishing The Broadway Theatre in Catford - and are a summary to a number of conversations (and enthusiastic building tours) with Martin Costello, The Theatres Artistic Director (now retired).

The proposals enclosed have been presented to the key Statutory Consultees: Historic England and The Theatres Trust. Both bodies support the key moves within the proposals, with the finer details needing further clarification in due course.

The proposals are in many ways quite pragmatic and seek to resolve some of the design flaws within the existing building and offer the theatre a more promising future.

The options for improvements to the building can be treated in isolation, or as a package. They are developed with economy in mind, as the budget for any scheme has not yet been defined.

The building is Grade II listed and we have been mindful of the buildings significant parts within all of the proposals.

This sketchbook is intended as a discussion piece, to assist in: Ongoing conversations, Applications for funding and (possibly) Integration into the wider Catford Area Action Plan - and other masterplan reports which may supersede it.

This sketchbook should be read in conjunction with other briefing memos prepared by the theatre, which identify essential ongoing repairs to the building.

Everything in this sketchbook to date, has been undertaken on a pro-bono basis, by Ian Chalk and Edward Whiteley of Ian Chalk Architects, and with additional input from Conservationist friends at Alan Baxters.

We are based at Farringdon in central London, but I live off Belmont Hill in Lewisham, so have a vested interest in making a meaningful contribution to the area.

We look forward to the opportunity to continue this discussion.

Yours faithfully

Ian Chalk

Ian Chalk RIBA
Ian Chalk Architects
70 Cowcross Street
London
EC1M 6EJ
0203 7807355
07785 973723
web: ianchalkarchitects.com

Introduction
Existing location plan
Existing ground floor
Existing lower-ground floor
Existing first floor
Existing second floor
Existing third floor
Existing fourth floor
Existing long section
Existing cross section

- Auditorium
- Chair store
- Studio theatre
- Dressing room
- Broadway Theatre
- Lightwell
- Council offices
- Catford Road
Existing cross section through stage
1950 - Jubilee Dance
Improving the studio
Existing studio

key constraints:

- column positions causing restricted views
- seating capacity could be increased
- adjoining gallery underused
- control room poorly positioned
Improved arrival and connection
Proposed studio

- Gallery to act as foyer for studio
- Improved entrance to studio
- Fixed capacity increased to 113
- Columns relocated
- Central control room

Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015
Proposed studio

- New truss to support lighting equipment
- Amphitheatre seating with unrestricted views
- Central control room
Improving the main auditorium
key constraints:

get-in is remote from stage and includes complicated changes in level

visibility obstructed in places - particularly front circle behind control desk

lack of good disabled facilities

very little backstage and wing accommodation

little flexibility for performance type

Working within the volume
Proposed cross section

Proposals for both stage and seating are illustrated together for simplicity, however one does not preclude the other and each proposal could be delivered independently.

- Main stalls access via first floor foyer
- Improved seating with unrestricted views
- Disabled seating at front
- Stage brought into open auditorium
- Stage/Back-stage proposals
- Fly tower retained for traditional performance
- Area for back stage
- Get-in directly from Broadway using lift
- Seating proposals

Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015
Catford Broadway
Proposed ground floor

Proposals for both stage and seating are illustrated together for simplicity, however one does not preclude the other and each proposal could be delivered independently.

Stage/ back-stage proposals

Seating proposals

Improved seating with unrestricted views

Auditorium

Stage brought into auditorium - open stage

Disabled seating at front

Increased backstage and wings

Get-in directly from Broadway

Proposed ground floor

Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015

Catford Broadway
Proposed first floor

Auditorium

stalls capacity 340

Bar

Bar

Foyer

access to circle

access to circle
Proposed second floor

Auditorium
circle
capacity 260

Control room

WC

access
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Greater audience comfort

Existing seat widths and row depths insufficient
seat width increased to 550mm minimum
depth of stall rows increased from 800mm to 890mm
depth of circle rows increased from 710mm to 800mm
Wider building considerations
AAP extract
A new 2nd entrance....?
A new 2nd entrance....?