

Mayor and Cabinet		
Title	Comments of the Sustainable Development Select Committee on the Beckenham Place Park Report and Petition.	
Contributor	Sustainable Development Select Committee	Item
Class	Part 1 (open)	February 2016

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 have been achieved by now) and has the council developed its own plan to renovate the Mansion House?