

MINUTES OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 29 June 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Liam Curran (Chair), Suzannah Clarke (Vice-Chair), Bill Brown, Amanda De Ryk, James-J Walsh, Mark Ingleby, Pauline Morrison, Eva Stamirowski and Pat Raven.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Paul Upex

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Brenda Dacres (Chair Standards Committee), Nick Harvey (Cycling Programme Manager), Sam Kirk (Strategic Waste & Environment Manager), Kplom Lotsu (SGM Capital Programmes), Simon Moss (Policy and Development Manager, Transport), Freddie Murray (SGM Asset Strategy and Technical Support), Katharine Nidd (Commercial and Investment Delivery Manager), Janet Senior (Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration), Kevin Sheehan (Executive Director for Customer Services), Nigel Tyrell (Head of Environment) and Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager)

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2016

1.1 That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 May be agreed as accurate record subject to the following amendment:

That "There should be positive engagement with TfL by the Council about the need for a quick decision about the potential relocation of the A205." be added to paragraph 5.3.

2. Declarations of interest

2.1 There were none.

3. Mayor and Cabinet response to Committee's review on High Streets

3.1 RESOLVED: That the Committee voted and agreed that items 3, 4, 5 and 6 be noted.

4. Mayor and Cabinet response to Committee's referral on Publishing viability assessments

4.1 RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

5. Mayor and Cabinet response to Committee's referral on Beckenham Place Park

5.1 RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

6. Mayor and Cabinet response to Committee's January referral on Catford regeneration programme

6.1 RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

7. Lewisham Cyclists' Lewisham Borough Cycling Strategy

7.1 This item was discussed after item 8 New waste & recycling services update.

7.2 A representative from Lewisham Cyclists introduced the report. The following key points were noted:

- According to the 2011 census, 2% of journeys in the borough were done by bicycle. The strategy sought to identify and evaluate existing barriers to people cycling to see how they could be improved.
- The strategy established three main principles to guide future cycling projects: a fully joined up cycle network, safer cycling, and cycling for everyone.
- There was little provision of cycling routes in the east or south of the borough, as shown on the schematic map on page 61. Lewisham Cyclists had also identified a lack of capacity on the cycling routes between the north and south of the borough.
- The main aim to improve cycling should be segregated cycling super highways. The A21 road would have space as it was a very wide road. This would be a big project to undertake.
- The Council was deemed to be good at softer measures to improve provision for cycling in the borough, such as the cycle hire scheme.

7.3 Simon Moss (Transport Policy and Development Manager) and Nick Harvey (Cycling Programme Manager) answered questions from the Committee. The following key points were noted:

- Redesigning the A21 would be an ambitious project. It was not clear how much funding Transport for London (TfL) would allocate to such a scheme. The manifesto of the new Mayor of London had mentioned an increased provision for cycling in the capital including prioritising Quiet Ways. Some good ideas about the A21 could be presented positively to TfL.
- A pinch point in redesigning the A21 to improve provision for cycling would be intersection with the A201 (South Circular). It would also be good to include links with the existing cycling networks in the borough.
- The strategy was an excellent starting point for improving provision for cyclists in the borough. The Lewisham Cyclists' strategy presented at the meeting could be used to start the process of developing a Lewisham Cycling Strategy to be formally adopted as Council policy and also referred to in the local development management plan.
- The Council's current cycling strategy was contained in the Council's 2011 Local Implementation Plan (LIP), which was the approach taken by TfL at the time. Now, boroughs were producing separate cycling strategies. The

Council's third LIP was due to be developed in 2017-18 so the timing of this strategy document was excellent.

- In the meantime, the Council could do some small interventions, such as identifying sites for and installing bike hangars. Currently, there were 32 bike hangars across the borough, mostly on land owned by social housing providers. If bike hangars were placed on the public highways, then a change of traffic management orders would have to take place which were very costly to arrange. The Council was building up a list of requests for bike hangars that could be used in the future to evidence demand for bike hangars.
- The maps presented in the cycling strategy did not show the entire network of cycling routes, just the Quietway type routes and the Waterlink Way. There were a number of quiet streets in the borough that were suitable for cycling as well but not shown.
- Officers advised that it would not be possible for the Council to promote under 11s to cycle on the pavement, as cycling on the pavement was an illegal offence regardless of one's age.

7.4 The Committee made a number of comments. The following key points were noted:

- The design of the A21 was 20 years old, and needed to be adapted for cycling beyond the provision of white lines as was mentioned in the Committee's Modern roads review.
- Local assemblies could be approached about their views of having bike hangars in their local area.
- Train stations could provide excellent locations for bike hangars as they often have CCTV and lots of people around so are seen as safe and are often placed close to town centres and easy to reach.
- The south of the borough was seen as poorly served in cycling provision, so if any quick wins were identified there, they should be considered a priority.
- The map of the cycling network presented in the strategy showed a lack of connections between well-established cycle ways such as between New Cross and Brockley and between Sydenham and Bell Green. This seemed to show that people needed to move up and down the borough on cycling routes for what otherwise could be a quick way across.
- The Council's cycling champion should be involved with local community cycling events.
- The Wheels for Wellbeing scheme should be promoted more.

7.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee thanked Lewisham Cyclists for their work, that the report be noted, and that the following views of the Committee be referred to Mayor and Cabinet:

The Committee commends the Lewisham Cyclists' Lewisham Borough Cycling Strategy to Mayor and Cabinet.

The Committee recommends that the strategy be formally adopted as Council policy and is also referred to in the local development management plan.

8. New Waste & Recycling Services Update

8.1 This item was considered before item 7 Lewisham Cyclists' Lewisham Borough Cycling Strategy

8.2 Sam Kirk (Strategic Waste & Environment Manager) gave a presentation to the Committee. The following key points were noted:

- The new garden waste service consist of one brown 240 litre bin per subscription. This service has been promoted by the Council since February. The costs were £45 for a subscription from now until the end of the municipal year and £60 for a full year's subscription.
- There were 6,300 subscribers at the time of the meeting. The target for the service was 5,000 for this point in the year. As the bins are delivered and become visible, more people were likely to subscribe. The subscription could be broken down per postcode but not per ward.
- A quarter of subscribers had opted to pay via PayPal. 52% of subscribers had been signed up to the service via a letter in Lewisham Life.
- The weekly food waste collections were likely to be rolled out in January 2017. The Christmas period was to be avoided for any changes as many people would be busy enough with waste disposal anyway.
- The communications strategy to inform people about these changes to their waste collection was split over four phases. The Council had received funding to provide tags for everyone's bins where this change would be implemented. This would likely happen shortly before the change. It was felt this approach would reach the most people. Officers had also been attending ward assemblies to discuss the changes to waste collections.

8.3 Sam Kirk answered questions from the Committee. The following key points were noted:

- When people signed up to the garden waste service subscription, the online form explained the difference between the one-off payment of £45 and the £60 payment for a full year.
- Most London boroughs charge more than £60 for a year's subscription, except the London Borough of Bexley which introduced fees after providing a free garden waste collection service.
- Drop off points were provided for people to dispose of their Christmas' trees across the borough, or people had to the option to cut up their tree and add it to their garden waste.
- The contamination of waste is costly issue for the Council. 23.39% of waste collected is classed as contaminated, but some of parts of that waste were still useable. The issue to focus on for the Council in terms of costs was the 13.52% of waste that had gone to landfill or energy from waste.
- The market price for textile waste and small electrical appliances had dropped considerably. This has meant it was difficult to find operators that wanted to add textile banks or small electrical appliance banks to the borough.

8.4 The Committee made a number of comments. The following key points were noted:

- Residents had provided positive feedback on the new garden waste service to a number of members of the Committee. Committee members were very pleased with the garden waste collection service.

8.5 RESOLVED: that the presentation be noted, that Committee thanked officers for their work, and that the Committee was delighted with the rollout of the new bins.

9. Asset Management System and Asset Register Update

9.1 Katherine Nidd (SGM Commercial and Investment Delivery) introduced the report. The following key points were noted:

- The Asset Management System (ASM) was a piece of software that was being developed in-house on SharePoint to keep a record of the Council's non-housing asset portfolio and to enable effective management of those assets. At the last update for the Committee in March there had been some delay but had not been any further delays since.
- The ASM was currently going through user acceptance training. The development of the facilities management aspects of the system had been left for the end of the process. After the user testing, formal training of staff in using the new system would take place.
- Work had been done to validate information and improve the quality of information held on the register of assets. In July 2015, 396 non-housing assets were listed as 'not classified' – in June 2016, there were only 39 assets in the category 'not classified'. There were also 13 more assets identified and added to the register.

9.2 Katherine Nidd, Freddie Murray (SGM Asset Strategy & Technical Support) and Janet Senior (Executive Director for Resources and Regeneration) responded to questions from the Committee. The following key points were noted:

- A new member of staff had been recruited to work on the ASM system, and had been tasked with providing extensive notes for users of the system and notes about the back-end of the system for future staff. This knowledge was also being shared with the London Borough of Brent as part of the shared IT service.
- The Council could think strategically about how to use its assets with the detailed information in the register of assets. An area-based approach is taken to determine how assets could be used, and the proposal is to involve Councillors as part of the initial work of reviewing several assets in a specific area for regeneration and development. This approach could be tried in for example the Lower Sydenham/Bell Green area.
- The further identification of pieces of land in the 'not classified' category had now taken place. The Council already tried to involve ward councillors when developments happened, but the pilot would aim to improve this process.

9.3 The Committee made a number of comments. The following key points were noted:

- Councillors might have knowledge about the ownership of pieces of land in their ward that Council officers do not have.
- The Lewisham Culture & Urban Development Commission's report from 2001 (item 11 on the agenda) had highlighted the need for "a holistic approach to planning which integrates land use, architecture and urban design with a sense of how this affects mental geography and people's sense of place" (page 103 report).
- Many people and organisations could be interested in plans for developments and regeneration, such as for example neighbourhood fora, housing providers, ward councillors and community organisations. The difficulty for the Council would be to have meaningful but contained engagement.
- Ward assemblies could offer opportunities for collaboration for area-based regeneration.

9.4 RESOLVED: that the report be noted, and that the Committee was pleased with the progress of work on the management of the Council's assets.

10. Sustainable Development Select Committee review of Catford regeneration programme Interim report

10.1 This item was considered alongside item 11 Creative Lewisham 2001 report.

10.2 Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) introduced the report. The following key points were noted:

- The report was based on the part 1 (open) evidence that the Committee had gathered during its review into the Catford regeneration programme, and the recommendations to Mayor and Cabinet it had previously made.
- The recommendations were for the Committee to agree the renewed terms of reference and timetable as they had decided to continue receiving evidence on the regeneration programme.

10.3 Janet Senior and Kplom Lotsu (SGM Capital Programme Delivery) answered questions from the Committee about the regeneration programme. The following key points were noted:

- Discussion with TfL about the possible relocation of A205 (South Circular) were progressing. The Council was making it clear that the road should be moved.
- A full report on the regeneration programme was being prepared for Mayor and Cabinet in the autumn and would be presented to the Committee first. The report would include a plan for communicating with residents and Councillors. It would include clear communication strategy for developing a vision for the town centre. The vision presented as part of the development

of the later withdrawn Catford town centre local plan would need to be reviewed to see what was still relevant in the current circumstances.

- The feasibility of the regeneration programme needed to be considered but the central element of the scheme was what Catford as a place would feel like. This sense of place should include thoughts about how the park, the stations and roads fit into the town centre, and access throughout should be a key consideration.
- Autumn would likely be time to engage residents in the plans for Catford town centre and ask for their contributions in visualising what the town centre should look like.
- As the demographics of the borough change, there may be more residents interested in a night time economy in Catford.

10.4 The Committee made a number of comments. The following key points were noted:

- The Broadway theatre would need to be a central focus in the town centre. There was currently very little to attract people to Catford in the evening and it would benefit the theatre if conditions for a healthy night time economy were taken into account in planning the town centre.
- The Committee felt strongly that this regeneration programme should be made to come alive for residents. The vision for the town centre should be developed alongside residents, and not be presented to residents as a fixed plan.
- Local residents had become galvanised about the future of the town centre when a planning application for a building on the former Catford Greyhound Stadium site was recently considered. Residents should be involved in developing a vision for the town centre.
- There are lessons to be learnt from the way the Lewisham Gateway development had progressed. Once a vision for a regeneration scheme had been developed it was important to ensure that vision was a central focus throughout the regeneration process, which could last years.
- An important pinch point for traffic on the South Circular was the narrow road under the rail bridge.
- The Creative Lewisham report from 2001 contained a constant call for sky high ambition and a clear vision for urban regeneration. The report had also painted a picture of the benefits a square in the middle of Catford.

10.5 RESOLVED: that the Creative Lewisham 2001 report be noted, that the Sustainable Development Select Committee review of Catford regeneration programme interim report be noted, that the Committee agree the renewed terms of reference for the review in section 6 of this interim report and the updated timetable in section 7 of this interim report, that the Chair of the Committee write to the Mayor of London to express the Committee's support for the relocation of the A205 (South Circular) through Catford town centre, that the Mayor of Lewisham be invited to attend the next meeting of the Committee on 14 September to discuss the Catford regeneration programme, and that the following of the Committee's views be referred to Mayor and Cabinet:

The Committee commends the Creative Lewisham 2001 report to Mayor and Cabinet, and particularly its call for a vision for urban developments in the borough and its call for high ambitions.

The Committee endorses the comments from the Lewisham Culture & Urban Development Commission's report about the benefits of a piazza in the centre of Catford:

"The square's main café will be a central meeting point and the library will put on events, often outside, which give a sense that libraries are innovative. The Council's offices, as a consequence, will become for citizens 'our place' and the interactions between ordinary people and officials will happen often by chance encounter. St Modwen's shopping centre will have had a dramatic overhaul having decided that, with these new developments, it can no longer hang back. The market will wind itself round into the square by putting on niche markets to appeal to varied tastes. The route down from the station will feel processional engender a sense of expectation of what is to come. The setting of the Catford stations will be vastly improved so making arrival a joyful experience and the open spaces will not feel cut off by fencing, and will at special moments become an entertainments venue relating well to what is going on in the square. At night the lighting of major civic buildings will create a feeling of drama." (Creative Lewisham: the report of the Lewisham Culture & Urban Development Commission, page 39).

11. Creative Lewisham 2001 report

11.1 RESOLVED: this item was considered as part of the discussion under item 10 Sustainable Development Select Committee review of Catford regeneration programme Interim report.

12. Select Committee work programme

12.1 Simone van Elk introduced the report. The following key points were noted:

- The items scheduled for next Committee meeting were the Lewisham Future Programme and Catford Regeneration programme update.
- The Catford regeneration programme update may have to be delayed till the October meeting.

12.2 The Committee discussed the work programme. The following key points were noted:

- The Committee requested further information on the contract between the Council and Glendales with relation to Beckenham Place Park as initially requested at the 14 January meeting of the Committee.
- The Mayor of Lewisham would still be invited to attend the September meeting even if the Catford regeneration programme update report was delayed.
- The Committee requested that the September meeting take place in Committee room 1 or 2 of the Civic Suite.

- A member of the Committee requested that meetings would avoid the school half term holidays.

12.3 RESOLVED: That the report be noted, and that work programme for the next Committee meeting on 14 September be agreed.

13. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet

7.1 RESOLVED: that the Committee's views under items 7 and 10 be referred to Mayor and Cabinet.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chair:

Date:
