

MINUTES OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE

Monday, 28 October 2019 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Liam Curran (Chair), Patrick Codd (Vice-Chair), Abdeslam Amrani, Suzannah Clarke, Louise Krupski and James-J Walsh and

APOLOGIES: Councillors Obajimi Adefiranye, Mark Ingleby and Pauline Morrison

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Stephen Penfold, Councillor Brenda Dacres (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport (job share)), Councillor Sophie McGeevor (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport (job share)), Tony Leach (Parks for London), Anne Slater (Lewisham Green Spaces Forum), Timothy Andrew (Scrutiny Manager), Kheng Chau (Senior Planning Lawyer), Viv Evans (Head of Programmes), Christopher Howard (Environmental Protection Officer), Jon Kanareck (Lewisham Homes), Martin Ryan (Head of Environmental Services) (Lewisham Homes), Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Director of Public Protection and Safety) and David Syme (Strategic Planning Manager)

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2019

1.1 **Resolved:** that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September be agreed as an accurate record.

2. Declarations of interest

2.1 Councillor Suzannah Clarke declared a non-prejudicial interest in relation to item four as member of an organisation that bids for funding to hold events in local parks.

3. Responses from Mayor and Cabinet

3.1 The Committee discussed the responses from Mayor and Cabinet – the following key points were noted:

- Members believed that the suggested policy for pubs should be strengthened.
- It was recognised that the policy would be an advance on the previous proposal – but there was concern that the presumption against development did not specify the types of pubs that should be protected.
- Members believed that historic (20 century and earlier) purpose built pubs- especially those that served as landmarks and key locations on high streets- should receive additional protections.
- Members welcomed the response on the redevelopment of Catford – however concerns were reiterated about the necessity for new infrastructure (including transport and services) to enable any new development (and serve existing communities).

- Members also reiterated their request for a ‘civic strategy’ for Catford – to recognise the town centre’s importance as the civic centre of the borough.
- 3.2 David Syme (Strategic Planning Manager) responded to a question from the Committee - the following key point was noted:
- Modelling had been carried out by the Greater London Authority which indicated that 2600 homes could be delivered in Catford within the existing capacity of the transport network.
- 3.3 **Resolved:** that the Committee would refer its views to Mayor and Cabinet as follows –
- The Committee recommends that the proposed policy for pubs in the upcoming local plan should be strengthened.
 - It is recognised that proposals from officers would be an advance on the previous position regarding local pubs – but there is concern that the intended presumption against development does not specify the types of pubs that should be protected.
 - Members believe that historic (20 century and earlier) purpose built pubs- especially those that served as landmarks and key locations on high streets- should receive additional protections.

4. Parks management review evidence session

- 4.1 Jon Kanareck (Director of Resident Service, Lewisham Homes) and Martin Ryan (Head of Environmental Services, Lewisham Homes) were invited to address the Committee – the following key points were noted:
- Lewisham Homes brought its services back in-house from Glendale in 2015.
 - The process had been successful and customer satisfaction had increased by 20%. However – there were cost implications as a result of bringing the service in-house.
 - Work had taken place with community organisations to increase access to green spaces for Lewisham Homes’ residents.
- 4.2 Jon Kanareck and Martin Ryan responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:
- Lewisham Homes maintained the quality of its in-house service through a rigorous programme of inspections.
 - Employee conditions and pay had improved as a result of bringing services in-house. This had led to an improvement in motivation of staff and the quality of their work. However – this had also resulted in increased pension and overhead costs.
 - Refuse collection services could not keep up with the volume of waste being produced on housing estates – which meant it frequently overflowed into green spaces.
 - It was hoped that there would be some benefits from the Council’s parks services being brought in-house. It might enable the sharing of facilities and services – as well as the maintenance of some spaces that currently fell between the care of Lewisham Homes and the parks service.

- Residents had expressed a preference for colourful planting in the summer – so the service had started annual planting (rather than perennials) – it was recognised that this was not as sustainable. Further discussions would be carried out with residents regarding sustainability and the climate emergency.
- Lewisham Homes only provided green spaces management and maintenance to Lewisham Homes stock – the Brockley PFI had its own arrangements for maintenance and management.
- The development of the ‘bee corridor’ was in early stages. The service had consulted colleagues in the council’s green spaces team when devising plans for the corridor. It also benefitted from the expertise and knowledge of its own staff.

4.3 Tony Leach (Parks for London) was invited to address the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- Parks for London was set up in 2002 in response to a Mayoral investigative committee findings about greenspaces in London.
- It was recognised that London’s parks and green spaces were fragmented – and that services were being delivered in 33 different ways by London boroughs, which stifled innovation and collaboration.
- Parks for London worked with local authorities and independent entities (such as park trusts and the Royal Parks) to share knowledge and good practice.
- Three years ago, the first ‘Good Parks for London’ report was published – which looked most closely at the delivery of services by local authorities and focused on improving quality.
- There was concern that services had sustained cuts of a number of years.
- Lewisham was previously at the top of the ‘Good Parks for London’ report. In this year’s report it was not at the top but it was still close to the top across all of the measures.

4.4 Tony Leach responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- The current trend was for London Boroughs to bring services back in-house for two main reasons: firstly there were very few costs savings still to be made from outsourcing services. There was the possibility that if contracts continued to be squeezed then providers might go out of business; secondly – the delivery of services in-house allowed for greater flexibility, especially during periods of seasonal demand.
- Parks for London was not only interested in parks and open spaces but also in the maintenance of green infrastructure from ‘doorstep to destination’. All green spaces mattered.
- The number of green spaces contractors in London had reduced from 15 to three in the past five years. This was partly because of acquisitions – but it was largely because there was very little money to be made in delivering green spaces management and maintenance services.
- There were ways to ensure that insourced parks services could be encouraged to maintain services. In some boroughs, user groups were enabled to report on the maintenance and management of parks and

green spaces. Parks for London had developed a quality manual to assess standards in parks which could be used to support this work.

- The presence of people in parks helped to maintain a sense of safety – there were examples of parks in which dog walkers – and residents in the vicinity of parks were given a special contact phone number to report issues.
- The days of having permanent staff at every park were over. However, some boroughs issued uniforms to members of friends groups – so that they stood out.
- Traditionally – councils had looked upon parks as assets that maintained themselves. However, this was not the case – parks needed management.
- Income generation could be part of the mix of activities in parks. Parks for London had developed an events policy for councils to use – it also benchmarked costs between boroughs.
- The quality of cafes in parks varied considerably. There were a number of issues to consider – including: local feeling towards established providers; affordability of the offer; the opportunity to improve provision.
- The Council might seek to manage green spaces as a whole rather than maintaining the artificial division between parks and housing green space.
- Sustainability was a key part of the judging for green flag awards. There was no contradiction between sustainability and meeting the green flag awards standards.
- In order to achieve a green flag award – a site had to have a management plan – which should help with bio-diversity and sustainability.
- It was recognised that the standards of parks were falling over time – as the squeeze of resources pushed boroughs to do the minimum to maintain their parks and green spaces.
- Parks user groups were formed for a variety of different reasons – often in response to a threat to a park. However, once they had achieved their objectives – these groups often lost their impetus. Support could be provided for user group – but care had to be taken about how this was delivered. Efforts by boroughs to set up user groups might be well meaning but they were fraught with problems.
- User groups should have a named person at the Council that they could contact for support.
- Sometimes user groups needed more coordinated support from fundraisers or other technical support.
- The Good Parks for London report was not perfect – but it was the only report that enabled boroughs to compare their services with each other.

4.5 Anne Slater was invited to address the Committee on behalf of the Lewisham Green Spaces Forum – the following key points were noted:

- The Forum welcomed the opportunity to contribute to the Committee’s review – but would welcome more time and additional opportunities to engage with the Committee on the issue of parks management and maintenance.
- Lewisham’s parks groups were made up of lots of different people – with varied interests and a range of concerns about management of parks, however, there were some key issues for all parks, including:

- Support for park rangers – or otherwise trained/named officers responsible for specific parks.
- Conservation and biodiversity.
- Tree planting (which it was felt should be carried out in liaison with friends groups). There were particular concerns about ongoing upkeep of newly planted trees.
- Recycling in parks was a significant concern as was the general approach to litter collection and bins in parks.
- Possible proposals for income generation – and the potential impact on parks.
- There were some concerns that the insourced parks service might not be managed as rigorously as the contract that was currently outsourced.

4.6 Anne Slater responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- It was recognised that Glendale was at the limit of what it could provide and still make money.
- It was hoped that the insourcing of the service would enable innovation and flexibility.
- There were tensions in some parks regarding the balance between formal planting; meadow land for biodiversity; and space for sports and other activities.

4.7 Councillor Sophie McGeevor (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport) was invited to address the Committee about the decision to insource the parks service – the following key points were noted:

- Insourcing would present a financial risk.
- Whilst it was likely that costs would increase – it was recognised that there would be benefits in terms of better and more flexible services with a better trained, better paid and better motivated workforce.
- There was a recognition of the importance of green spaces for sustainability and environmental protection. It was believed that the insourcing of the parks service would create more opportunities for the parks service to respond to these issues.
- Parks friends groups were an important part of the Council's approach to parks. There was a clear disparity between parks with and those without friends groups.
- Friends groups had been successful at attracting external funding for parks. They were also helping to prioritise the £360k of funding that had been allocated through Lewisham's new greening fund.
- She was proud of Lewisham's parks and of local user groups.
- There was no intention to 'sweat assets' in parks. One of the benefits of bringing the service in-house would enable the Council to retain income and to manage events for local benefit.
- One of the benefits of holding events in parks was that they might bring in new users.
- Parks cafes were important for all parks users – but particularly for parents and for people with limited space at home.

- There wasn't necessarily a correlation between income/deprivation and local engagement in parks user groups. Some of the most active, democratic and engaged user groups were in deprived parts of the borough.
- 4.8 Councillor Brenda Dacres (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport) was invited to address the Committee – the following key points were noted:
- It was recognised that Lewisham had a successful parks service – but it should strive to continue to improve – and insourcing should help the Council to do so.
 - Parks user groups should be praised for the work that they did for parks. Their contributions should not be underestimated. Further consideration should be given to supporting parks that did not have user groups to ensure that they did not fall behind.
- 4.9 In the Committee's discussion, the following key points were also noted:
- It was recognised that friends groups and volunteers were a vital resource for parks.
 - The Committee recognised that the parks service was performing well.
 - Members were concerned about the costs of bringing the service in-house. It was proposed that the service should stay contracted to Glendale.
 - Members recognised concerns about the need to manage the performance of the in-house parks service.
 - Members were concerned about the lack of accessible play facilities in the borough.
 - Members believed that there should be a play strategy for the borough – that would take into account the needs of all user groups.
 - The Committee welcomed the contribution of user groups to the delivery of parks services – however- it believed that there should be a volunteer management framework for parks as well as a strategy for engagement (to ensure that parks without user groups did not miss out on opportunities for support; to ensure that roles and responsibilities were defined between user groups and the parks service and; to ensure that adequate succession planning could be put in place).
 - Members wanted to better understand whether there were opportunities for the Council to provide commercial maintenance and management services to private spaces in the borough.
 - Members reiterated concerns about the balance of meadow land/space for biodiversity and other spaces in parks.
 - The Committee noted concerns about the quality of spaces for sports in the borough. It was noted that there should be a balance of spaces for different activities in parks – and that these could work harmoniously together.
- 4.10 **Resolved:** that the evidence for the Committee's review be noted.

5. Implementation of the air quality action plan

- 5.1 Christopher Howard (Senior Environmental Protection Officer) introduced the report – the following key points were noted:

- There was a legal requirement to provide a status report to the Greater London Authority (GLA) on the implementation of the air quality action plan.
- The GLA had approved the report (which covered activities in 2018) and was happy with it overall. In particular, the integration of different groups and various strands of work had been welcomed.
- The main focus of the report was on transport – and a number of actions related to the management of vehicle emissions.
- The main purpose of the air quality action plan was to draw together the different pieces of work that were taking place across the Council.
- The air quality working group met regularly to support this work – as did the strategic air quality board.
- The number of monitoring locations in the borough had been increased to more than 50 – with a number being located near to schools. The ‘super site’ in Honor Oak Park was also monitoring air quality in the borough. It was one of only three locations in the country that had been chosen for this investment.
- There were future proposals to create a monitoring site in Deptford to measure levels of PM2.5 and NO2.
- A number of the actions in plan required funding to carry out – and the Council had been successful in accessing external funding for new projects.
- A successful bid had been made to Kings College London to take forward some work on the accuracy of air quality sensors.
- Future work would be carried out to review the air quality action plan to ensure it stayed in line with the approach from the GLA.
- The intention would be to prioritise the actions in the plan to make it more accessible. There would also be an increased focus on the actions that residents could take to improve air quality.
- One of the most significant future developments would be the expansion of the ultra-low emission zone. Consideration would be given to the mitigating factors required for the areas around the south circular that were not due to be included in the zone.
- One of the key messages from Transport for London was that people would need to use their cars far less – and that there would need to be a greater shift to other forms of transport.

5.2 Christopher Howard and Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Director for Public Protection and Safety) responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- The issue with personal air quality sensors was that they were only indicative of air quality. However – one of the benefits of personal air quality sensors was that they could be used for comparisons before and after interventions.
- The air quality monitor project would help people to better understand the appropriate uses and reliability of residents monitoring air quality.
- There was a variety of different air quality monitoring equipment being used by residents – some people were also building and using their own.
- Lewisham had 50 sites with diffusion tubes – that were adjusted against national and reference sites.

- There were close connections between the work to improve air quality and the climate emergency action plan.
- Research into the 20mph speed limit found that in areas that were likely to be congested – the speed limit helped to keep traffic moving and would be likely to reduce pollution. In areas of low congestion – the speed limit might increase vehicle emissions because engines did not operate as efficiently at low speeds. Nonetheless – it was believed that lower speed limits made the roads feel safer for pedestrians and cyclists (consequentially reducing emissions overall).

5.3 In Committee discussions – the following key points were also noted:

- The quality of the Council’s equipment for monitoring air quality was very high. The issues that had been identified were with residents monitoring air quality.
- The Council should publicise more information about air quality and air quality monitoring.
- It was noted that the 20mph speed limit had mixed effects on air quality – but it was recognised that the limit was safer for pedestrians (who were more likely to survive being hit a vehicle travelling at 20mph than at higher speeds).
- Members welcomed the planned future rollout of healthy neighbourhoods programme.

5.4 Councillor Sophie McGeevor addressed the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- Lewisham’s air quality was monitored by Kings College London – which was one of the world leaders in air quality monitoring.
- Lewisham’s 50 air quality monitoring stations (combined with three permanent sites and the new super site) allowed modelling to be carried out to a high degree of accuracy across the entire borough.
- Monitoring did not have to be carried out on every street in the borough in order for the Council to develop a picture of air quality across the borough.
- The quality of Lewisham’s monitoring had been recognised by the GLA in response to the air quality management plan. The super site had also been placed in the borough in recognition of the quality of local monitoring.
- There were issues with people doing their own monitoring – on one hand it was helpful because it drew attention to the poor quality of London’s air. However – there were instances in which home monitoring was different to the Council’s monitoring. This could be for a number of reasons (including the possibility that the monitoring was being carried out over varying time periods, for different durations or of different pollutants). It was important that people had confidence in the quality and accuracy of Lewisham’s monitoring.
- The Council’s monitoring indicated that air quality across the borough was poor – as was the case with all inner London boroughs.

5.5 **Resolved:** that the report be noted.

6. Parking policy update

6.1 This item was deferred to the December meeting.

7. Surrey Canal Triangle design framework draft SPD

7.1 Viv Evans (Head of Programmes) introduced the report – the following key points were noted:

- The report and its appendices were part of the new approach to the comprehensive redevelopment of Surrey Canal Triangle.
- Over the past 18 months the Mayor and officers had brought together the two principal parties (Millwall football club and Renewal) to explore how they could work together and collaborate with the Council.
- The Council and the two principal parties had agreed some key objectives in order to: facilitate the delivery of a comprehensive development of high quality; deliver a significant uplift in genuinely affordable housing (from that which was previously agreed through the outline planning permission for Renewal); enable the Millwall football club to have a secure long-term future in the borough; deliver a mixed use community in the Surrey Canal Triangle.
- The report was a key part of achieving these key objectives.
- The Surrey Canal Triangle was currently an allocation in the statutory core strategy for the Council – as strategic site allocation three (SSA3).
- Agreement had been reached between the Council and the principal parties that the best way forward would be for the Council to set out its key objectives and elaborate on the allocation of SA3 in a strategic design framework (which is what the Committee was being asked to consider).
- Mayor and Cabinet had agreed to terminate the previous land sale agreement.
- The SPD had been developed in consultation with the two principal parties.

7.2 Viv Evans and David Syme responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- The Council granted an outline planning permission in 2011 (which was still in existence and could still be implemented) for Renewal – however – it required the transfer of three pieces of land to facilitate.
- The Council had previously entered into a compulsory purchase indemnity agreement for land in Surrey Canal Triangle to enable the development. This would have ensured that the cost of the compulsory purchase would have been covered by Renewal – should the purchase have been required.
- The Council agreed that it would continue to work with Renewal on a varied compulsory purchase indemnity agreement – in case there was a requirement for other pieces of land to enable the development, which the company could not acquire through negotiation with landowners.
- The Council agreed with principal parties that it would own the strategic objectives for the Surrey Canal triangle and that both parties would be free to submit applications to enable the redevelopment of the area.
- Any planning application would be assessed against the strategic plan for the area.

- If the decision was taken by Mayor and Cabinet to carry out consultation on the plan – then the intention would be to bring a final version to the Committee’s meeting in January 2020 – in advance of formal adoption by Mayor and Cabinet.
- The SPD had to be in line with the existing core strategy allocation – it did not set any targets for affordable housing above those in the core strategy.
- The Council was in advanced discussions with Renewal regarding a new planning application, which was likely to be submitted before the end of the calendar year.
- The existing outline planning application was for 2400 homes – with 12% affordable housing (split approximately 25% social rent and 75% shared ownership) which meant that around 288 affordable housing units (78 social rent 210 intermediate housing) would be provided. The expectation was that the overall quantity of housing would increase to 3500 units (subject to a planning application) with 35% affordable housing (a 70/30% split in favour of affordable rent) this would increase the number of units for social rent from 78 to 850.
- The train station was still a key part of the proposal (and was included in the SPD). However – at the time of the outline planning permission by Renewal, the company had committed several million pounds towards the delivery of the station. Since that time, however, TfL had secured £23m of housing infrastructure funding from the government to deliver the station.
- The Committee’s comments about the funding for the station were noted – but it was informed that the issue of developer contributions would be considered in any future planning application (rather than the SPD).
- The Council had not committed to a single faith centre in Surrey Canal triangle. The existing planning allocation had proposed that space be set aside for ‘community use’.
- The new outline planning application was a ‘hybrid’ application which included elements of detail and elements in outline. Most of the application would be ‘outline’. It would have to conform with the strategic site allocation – and once the SPD had been adopted – it would be assessed against that document
- The legal parameters of what could be achieved through the design framework were limited. It would not be possible to create new policy.
- Designation of specific uses for the site could not be resolved in the SPD – references to a ‘faith centre’ would be amended in the draft.
- It was not clear what proposals Millwall football club might bring forward for the site (other than improvements to the stadium). It was possible that they would come forward with a mixed use proposal around the stadium – but no discussions were currently taking place.

7.3 In Committee discussions – the following key points were also noted:

- That the Council no longer intended to compulsorily purchase land around Millwall football club – and that the club would be free to submit its own application for development.
- The Committee noted the funding that had been provided by the government for the delivery of the station and it highlighted the

importance of securing developer contributions for affordable housing and other infrastructure projects.

- Members were concerned about the development of the proposed 'faith centre' for the development in Surrey Canal Triangle and the potential use of community infrastructure levy (CIL) or section 106 (planning obligation) funding for this purpose (Kheng Chau (Senior Planning Lawyer) informed the Committee that the Council's regulation 123 CIL list stated which infrastructure could benefit from CIL monies and it specifically excluded places of worship).
- Members were uncertain what opportunities and influence they had to ensure that any development in Surrey Canal Triangle would meet the needs of the local community (and any future community) in 2019 (and beyond) rather than 2011.
- The Committee expressed concern about the significant changes that had taken place in Surrey Canal Triangle since 2011, including: the loss of the sports centre; the development of the train station with the use of public funds and the change of the proposed multi-faith centre into a 'cathedral sized' church for a single faith group.
- Members reiterated their concerns about the status of the developer 'Renewal' – in terms of its corporate set up and its capacity to carry out the development.

7.4 **Resolved:** that the Committee would share its views with Mayor and Cabinet as follows –

- The Committee welcomes the advances in discussions between all parties regarding the future development of Surrey Canal Triangle.
- The Committee is concerned about the lack of any new analysis¹ regarding the needs of existing and potential future communities in Surrey Canal Triangle and it recommends that Mayor and Cabinet should seek assurances that further detailed work will be carried out to assess local need for social and physical infrastructure (for both new and existing communities).
- The Committee broadly welcomes the draft supplementary planning document. However, it believes that the 'D1' planning designation for community uses should not at this stage refer to any sub-category of usage.
- The Committee notes that there are a number of issues surrounding any future planning applications that other Council committees will need to address. In addition, the Committee recommends that the Housing Select Committee should consider the developing SPD in relation to issues of affordable and social housing.

The Committee also made a number of general comments about any future development in Surrey Canal Triangle:

- The Committee heard that alternative sources of funding had been secured for the development of a new train station to serve Surrey Canal Triangle – and that developer contributions were no longer required. Therefore, the

¹ See particularly, the section in the draft design framework on 'social infrastructure', page 100.

Committee recommends that proper consideration be given to using this funding for the delivery of additional affordable housing.

- The Committee also believes that any future development in the vicinity of Millwall football club should consider the potential benefits to the local community.
- Members of the Committee highlighted councillors' previous questions about the viability of Renewal – and urged that consideration should be given to any future due diligence necessary to assure working relationships with developers.

8. Local Plan update

David Syme introduced the report – the following key points were noted:

- The Council was in the advanced stages of developing the new local plan.
- Four member briefings had been held to update councillors on progress.
- At the first session (July 2018) – the challenges and opportunities arising from the new plan were presented; the second session set out the direction of travel for the new plan - as well as generally setting out the strategic objectives for the new plan; in the third session, strategic objectives were agreed and in the final session (July 2019) members were presented with the draft development management policies and draft site portfolio work.
- Officers were conscious that there was lots of information for members to take on board as well as lots of changes in comparison to the previous development management policies.
- Not as much feedback from councillors had been received as had been anticipated.
- A review of 'metropolitan open land' was currently taking place – this was not with the intention of building on metropolitan open land. It was a standard review, in line with the review of the local plan.
- The infrastructure delivery plan was also being reviewed. This would set out the parks, schools and transport infrastructure that needed to be delivered in order to facilitate the implementation of the local plan. Departments across the Council would be involved in the development of the plan.
- A viability study was also being carried out. Fifty sites across the borough would be 'tested' for their viability for development. In particular, it would review the viability of sites to support affordable housing.
- The plan was in an advanced stage. It was proposed that a draft of the plan would be presented to the committee in December 2019 – before approval for consultation by Mayor and Cabinet in the spring of 2020.

8.2 David Syme responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- It was a difficult time to prepare a local plan – given the level of uncertainty in a number of areas – and in particular the challenges to the assumptions in the London Plan.
- Inspectors proposed that the number of small sites for housing delivery being proposed in the local plan should be reduced by half – which in turn – reduced the overall amount of housing proposed in London by 20% (over the lifetime of the Plan).

- The Council had taken legal advice on the development of the local plan, which clearly stated that Lewisham could not pause preparation of the plan in light of the questions around the London Plan. However, this was complicated by the fact that the London Plan would be assessed for conformity with the old national planning policy framework and Lewisham's local plan would be assessed against the new national planning policy framework.
- The figure for small sites in Lewisham per annum based on the original London Plan assessment was for the delivery of 800 homes a year on small sites. Based on the new figures this would be 350-400 homes a year (of the 2117 homes per year proposed for Lewisham in the London Plan).

8.3 **Resolved:** that the report be noted.

9. Select Committee work programme

9.1 The Committee discussed the work programme for its December meeting and agreed to make space for the draft local plan by moving back its final evidence session on parks management.

9.2 The Committee also discussed the evidence it had gathered for the parks management in-depth review - the following key points were noted:

- That the Committee would make note of some draft recommendations for the parks review:
 - The Council should develop a play strategy for parks that includes a plan for accessible play.
 - That planning policy should be reviewed to ensure that play facilities for children were close to proposed developments.
 - That further work should take place to map out the contribution of parks user groups – and that the new parks service should develop a model for engagement with and support of user groups. This should also include support to enable continuity of user groups in the event that there are changes in key members.
 - That there should be additional work carried out to develop monitoring protocols for parks – and that this might include work with parks user groups.
 - That the playing pitch strategy should work in combination with the Council's approach to bio-diversity.
 - That planting should be carried out - where possible - to support bio-diversity.
 - That consideration should be given to the development of an integrated pest management policy.
 - That the Committee would welcome further information about national capital accounting.
 - That there should be recognition of the social value of cafes in park and that the management of cafes should be linked with the Councils broader policy objectives.
 - That the Council should carry out a review of historic features, memorials and special areas of planting in parks and open spaces

when it took on the management and maintenance of parks and open spaces.

- That there should be renewed cooperation between Lewisham Homes and the insourced parks service.

9.3 The Committee agreed all of the components of its referral on the draft SPD (7.4).

10. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet

10.1 **Resolved:** that the Committee's comments under items three and seven be referred to Mayor and Cabinet.

The meeting ended at Time Not Specified

Chair:

Date:
