

## Appendix B – Summary of Ward Assembly NCIL Meetings

<b>NCIL: Bellingham ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Jacq Paschoud
Attendance	31
No. of Recommended Projects	8
Date of meeting	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

### Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: In regards to the Air monitoring project – can there be clarification on the location of the project?

Response: Project applicants will need to liaise with Council Highways department to agree specific location

Question: Is there already existing air monitoring provision?

Response: The air monitoring provision is in addition to current monitors. Also existing air monitors are not funded from NCIL

Comment: Children’s project is very welcome in the area especially kids art, due to effects of lockdown. Good for children and young people’s mental health and wellbeing

Overall support for all recommended projects, attendees expressed their appreciation for projects, and acknowledged the impact the projects will have on community cohesion in the ward.

### Further action taken by officers

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

<b>NCIL: Blackheath ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Juliet Campbell
Attendance	42
No. of Recommended Projects	5
Date of meeting	3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2022

### Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Comment: In regards to St Margaret’s project, resident would like to see individual projects working with other service providers for example Lewisham donation hub

Response: All projects will be given support and provided with links to appropriate networks.

Comment: Resident expressed concern about play area for Blackheath project, open space and residential space next to area.

Response: Two formal consultations through council have taken place over a number of years, residents were asked to comment. Cllr De Ryk asked that all concerns are also raised with her for feedback

Question: Concerned about high traffic on Blackheath Hill, due to LTNs, is the Greening for Blackheath project needed over reducing traffic in the area

Response: The NCIL project is about mitigation and about doing something positive, however concerns have been raised and representations to Royal Borough Greenwich Council have been.

Cllr De Ryk also mentioned that there are residents meetings where Royal Borough of Greenwich Cllrs are involved in regarding the concerns of displacement with Greenwich LTNS. Concerns have also been raised about how the comments from Royal Greenwich consultation – as the consultation was not in Lewisham concerns raised about how Lewisham residents were weighted in consultation.

### **Further action taken by officers**

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

<b>NCIL: Brockley ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Obajimi Adefiranye and Cllr Stephen Penfold
Attendance	29
No. of Recommended Projects	9
Date of meeting	25 <sup>th</sup> January

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

The recommended projects were accepted by the meeting. No questions were raised during the discussion about the NCIL process and the funded projects. Residents welcomed support for projects recommended.

### **Further action taken by officers**

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

<b>NCIL: Catford South ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr James Royston
Attendance	28
No. of Recommended Projects	7
Date of meeting	20 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

The recommended projects were accepted by the meeting. A number of questions were raised during the discussion about the NCIL process and the funded projects. Key among these were:

Question: What was the methodology used for distributing of NCIL funds across the borough

Response: Councillor Smith provided an overview of NCIL and stated that NCIL is intended as a means of mitigating the negative impact of building and development activity. He further explained that Catford South, having experienced little large scale development, was never going to be one of the wards with a high level of NCIL funding. He explained that, in fact, Catford South had been a net beneficiary of the distribution methodology.

Question: What is the proposed location of cycle storage within the ward

Response: The meeting was informed that the Council's Highways Department will consult with residents on exact locations.

Question: There is a lack of projects addressing tree planting in the ward

Response: The meeting was informed that other non-NCIL funds were available for tree planting and these would be pursued.

### **Further action taken by officers**

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

<b>NCIL: Crofton Park ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Chris Barnham
Attendance	38
No. of Recommended Projects	5
Date of meeting	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

Question: Residents asked how the remaining fund (£1,268.19) will be used, if this will go back to other wards that have been oversubscribed or will stay with the ward.  
Response: Councillors have committed to use the funding for projects to benefit local residents.

Question: “Fourth Reserve – Olive Leaf circle” project - One resident commented on the project in terms of numbers of beneficiaries and involvement of the local community.  
Response: The main group of beneficiaries has complex needs, other local groups can request to use the space, and the project will also involve volunteers.

“Stillness Eco Garden” - Cllr Anwar expressed his conflict of interest on Stillness School project as a father of a Stillness School Pupil.

One of the residents commented that this project will benefit only the school children and their families

Response: the application specifies that green space will be available for other groups outside of the school hours.

Residents asked more information about the “Rock-iOrganisation” project

Response: The officer provided a brief summary of the project. The organisation has been recently constituted and has been very active during the COVID-19 lockdown. One of the aims of the NCIL ward fund is to create the opportunity to build relationships with new organisations and groups.

### **Further action taken by officers**

Further information on the “Rock-iOrganisation” project is now included in the summary on the Assembly web page.

<b>NCIL: Downham ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Coral Howard
Attendance	32
No. of Recommended Projects	3
Date of meeting	24 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

The recommended projects were accepted by the meeting. A number of comments were made by those in attendance, including:

- Welcoming the fact that many of the projects are targeted at young people
- Welcoming the significant planned development of Durham Hill Park – this was considered to be a very positive step.

Councillor Howard reinforced these comments by stating that the overall NCIL programme had enabled the investment of significant funds in projects that had been identified by the community and discussed over a number of years.

### **Further action taken by officers**

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

<b>NCIL: Evelyn ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Caroline Kalu
Attendance	54
No. of Recommended Projects	19
Date of meeting	22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

During the assembly meeting the following themes were raised by attendees relating to NCIL and/or the recommended projects:

- Comments were made regarding the eligibility of projects for NCIL funding and if it was correct for NCIL to fund projects that focus on advocacy services.

- Questions were also raised regarding whether or not some of the recommended projects could actually be funded through budgets from council departments
- Regarding the number of youth projects recommended in the ward a number of attendees expressed a view that it was important that older residents should not be forgotten
- Some residents expressed concern around the location of the Forest school project and if it was appropriate given a perceived risk to the existing habitat and wildlife on the site. It was also noted that access to the site may be unsafe
- It was asked why a greening master plan was proposed to receive funding when there is a resident-led greening master plan.
- A question was raised regarding the gym/play areas that were being funded and why other play areas with broken equipment did not receive funding

### **Response and further action taken by officers:**

- After review, it was agreed that the assessment and recommendations for youth projects was sound and had followed the criteria and assessment process set out. Minor updates would also be made to the summaries to enable greater understanding of the projects. The issue about consultation and engagement with communities will be considered as wider learning
- Officers acknowledged at the meeting and afterwards that the summary presented did not give a full overview of the project relating to energy advice; that the service offered a fuller wrap-around service that was well presented with clear need and benefit identified and did not duplicate other services. This project summary has been amended accordingly.
- Officers investigated the issue in relation to funding the CIC associated with development agencies, specifically in relation to whether the project bid for was already being delivered by the developer. As a result, it was agreed that this funding would be withdrawn and reallocated to a number of other recommended projects who had received significantly less than they requested, and where officers could see that the re-allocation would make a significant difference to delivery.
- In relation to the forest school, this project was brought to the greening panel, and no specific issues were raised, but as with all proposed projects, the project milestones and outputs will need to be agreed prior to any work being undertaken, and if any issues are identified as part of this process, these will be taken into account.

<b>NCIL: Forest Hill ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Sophie Davis
Attendance	28
No. of Recommended Projects	8
Date of meeting	29 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- Attendees wanted to better understand the rationale behind the decision not to recommend certain projects, before agreeing the recommendations.
- A resident noted that the Forest Hill Children's Library application included funding for new artwork to be commissioned. They requested confirmation that the funding recommended would be sufficient for this.
- Residents also requested clarification of the steps that would be taken to ensure that those recommended for less than they initially requested, will be able to deliver their projects
- Four (4) participants commented on the very well-run process which was seen as extremely rigorous, and thanked the council for the support for those preparing bids. Favourable comparisons were drawn with other large grant-making bodies of which some participants had experience.
- Four (4) participants made specific comments supporting the programme of recommended projects.

### **Response and further action taken by officers**

- Officers clarified that decisions on whether to recommend for funding, were based on an initial strict scoring system with criteria applied equally across all applications. This included ensuring that delivery was within the ward and benefitting ward residents. This was followed by a further process of assessment which looked at wider considerations such as feasibility of delivery, balance of projects across individual wards, and enabling the maximum number of projects to receive support. A further group of projects were referred to other council funding streams, for example sustainable Christmas trees.
- Those projects not recommended for Ward NCIL funding will be offered a programme of on-going support with bid-writing techniques, together with information sessions and workshops on identifying suitable funders including different council funding streams. This is in addition to the support which was previously provided at the bid preparation stage.
- With regard to the Children's library project, officers were able to assure the meeting that the costings provided for the project have been assessed as deliverable.

- Decisions on reducing recommended amounts were made following intense scrutiny of bids, to identify areas for reduction which would not compromise the integrity of their projects. For example, some project budgets were “modular”, enabling a substantial part of the project to be implemented with less funding. Discussions will take place with individual groups following the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 9 March, to establish and agree deliverables and agree targets for monitoring purposes.

<b>NCIL: Grove Park ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Hilary Moore
Attendance	50
No. of Recommended Projects	5
Date of meeting	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

#### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- The resident who submitted the proposal for a cross ward Baseline Feasibility Study to improve active travel in Grove Park and Lee Green raised a number of questions about why their project had not been recommended, this included
  - Why the project was recommended in Lee Green but not in Grove Park even though Transport and Streets was identified as a top priority for Grove Park at the Assembly meeting and on Common Place consultation.
  - Why it was said at the meeting that concrete and deliverable projects were felt to be more of a priority than feasibility studies that may not have a concrete output after 2 years, but another feasibility study for Linear Park had been recommended
  - That overall there were a number of inconsistencies in the assessment process and non-transparency in the scoring process.
  - Three other residents echoed these comments about the project
- A statement was made by a resident that the lack of safe active travel in the ward makes it incredibly unsafe to travel on bikes and this will continue to contribute to poor air quality, more people using cars and increased traffic jams.
- A comment was made by a resident who expressed their support for the Youth Club bid but was disappointed that the only bid from an early year’s project for £1,095 to inspire crowdfunding for what they want to achieve was not recommended. They queried the comment by the chair about wanting to ensure the NCIL funding provides for all ages, but this has not been reflected in the bids recommendation. They asked if there are any plans in place at ward level to support early years 0-5 years.
- A question was asked by a resident on whether the bids scoring sheet can be made public, so people can see how each bids was scored and why they were recommended for funding in view of the concerns raised on the cross ward cycling

bid. Interest was expressed by a resident who declared that they were not linked to any of the bids on being able to see how some applications did better than others to have a better understanding of the justification for those recommended.

- A further comment was made by a resident that it is important for scoring to be released to reassure residents to feel comfortable with the choices made by council/councillors/independent assessors.
- The recommendation to fund the Grove Park Carnival and Dog Show was queried by a resident. A question was raised about why it needs NCIL funding now given that this event has been happening in Grove Park for a number of years without NCIL funding
- A question was asked about the non-recommended project for the refurbishment of the toilets in Chinbook Meadows. Residents and Cllrs both highlighted its deteriorating current state. The residents asked whether the Council has any plans to fund the refurbishment in some other ways.
- There were no other comments that opposed the other recommendations; when asked to formally register disagreement with the recommendations no-one did so. It was agreed that the comments made by the Assembly would be fed back in the Mayor and Cabinet report.

### **Response and further action taken by officers**

- Cross-ward Active Travel Project – officers underlined the importance of scoring and that the project had not scored as highly as other applications. On the question of feasibility studies both officers and Councillors responded that the Linear Park feasibility study was put forward as part of a longer process of work already undertaken and would form one part of future work already planned in the area.

Officers and Councillors acknowledged that active travel and safer cycle routes was an important issue and felt that it could be looked at as part of a wider strategy for the borough.

- Response to the early year's project question – Officers explained that each application was scored on their merits based on the evidence provided in the application and this bid had not scored high enough. The council will offer support and advice to the applicants whose bids were unsuccessful and support them to access other funding opportunities available. The recently launched community lottery scheme and the 3 community fundraiser funded through the Main Grant programme was cited as examples of how the council intend to raise funds for small community organisations around particular themes.

Cllrs Clarke declared that although she had a personal connection with the play group as both her children use the facility, however, she had to stand aside from her personal connection with the project and view the application from the procedure outlined for the NCIL process. She reiterated what officer had said about offering help to projects to get funding from other directions.

- Publishing of scores – officers reiterated that the NCIL funds were administered as a grants programme, which would not publish scores of individual applications as this is confidential and sensitive information. However, officers offered projects the chance for more detailed feedback on their applications – this was included in the letter to all non-recommended projects
- Grove Park Carnival and Dog Show – officers clarified that this project had previously been funded through Assembly Funds and did meet the NCIL criteria. The purpose of the award was to provide the organising group with seed funding which will enable them to raise additional fund to ensure that the one and only Grove Park annual event occurs. The events gets many people out using the parks the park that might not otherwise.
- Toilets in Chinbrook Meadows – Officers provided information on the community toilet scheme funded by the council and run by Lewisham Local for the benefit of those who might not be aware of the project. Part of the aim of the scheme is to leverage businesses to open their toilet for public use. Officers gave a promise to work with Lewisham Local as part of their contract to look at the issues raised and what can be done to address those issues.

Cllrs also acknowledged the real need to get the toilets facility in Chinbrook Meadows refurbished and will be liaising with council officers to look at how this and other non-recommended projects can be delivered through other form of funding pots in the future.

<b>NCIL: Ladywell ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Liz Johnston-Franklin
Attendance	77
No. of Recommended Projects	11
Date of meeting	20 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

#### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- A comment was made that although all the recommended bids looks excellent, the view was expressed that none seems to be covering infrastructure. More youth club facility identified as a need in the ward. Further comment that under the common understanding, the music festival, though fantastic and well deserving of the fund recommended may be classed as infrastructure by many, however, the council needs to be clearer in its guidance when considering doing the next round by providing clear examples of projects classed as revenue from those that are infrastructure.

#### **Response**

The Council collects receipt from development on an ongoing basis. It is possible that NCIL rounds will be rolled out every 2 years to give project time to deliver on their proposal. Decision on this is still undecided.

The NCIL regulation states that infrastructure can happen in two ways i.e. bricks and mortar projects but also projects about community cohesion promoting togetherness. It was on those basis that people have applied for funding for the two different kinds of projects strands. Agreed that this could have been made more explicit in the guidance and have been noted for next round.

- Comment about the process from a member of the Assembly coordinating group who had assumed that the Coordinating Group members would have some sort of involvement in the assessment process but this never happened. Felt that he did not have enough information to comment on or agree or disagree with the recommendations.

**Response**

The officer responding to the comment on the non-involvement of Coordinating group member in the NCIL assessment process provided the explanation that delays caused by Covid 19 and the urgency to get the funding out before the election period begin was a factor. Given the impact of Covid on communities, there was an urgency to allocate the fund sooner rather than later and there was no time to conduct the kind of engagement process that would ordinarily have applied in this instance.

- A resident felt that it was surprising that there are no projects about Ladywell arena, given the issue about engaging people in healthy lifestyles. There should be a way to engage increasing physical activities for local residents and hard to reach individuals
- A question about what the thermoplastic crossings are and whether they do improve safety. Slightly worried that they might give pedestrians a false sense of security if drivers don't need to slow down at the approach.

**Response**

Council expert panel were consulted on bids fitting their area of expertise. The council's Highway panel were consulted on the thermostatic bid and they were broadly in support of the project and felt it was a feasible project to carry forward.

- A question was asked about the type of monitoring that will be undertaken to ensure projects has achieved the intended output they hope to do.

**Response**

A response that a discussion will be had with each bid proposal to agree a set of outcomes and the milestone for their intended projects especially where projects have not been fully funded once the final approval has been agreed by Mayor and Cabinet. There would be a monitoring template that will be used by officers on a quarterly basis to get feedback from the grant funded organisations

**No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers**

<b>NCIL: Lee Green ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Octavia Holland
Attendance	58
No. of Recommended Projects	8
Date of meeting	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- A comment made on the recommended bid by Lee Green Consortium, citing insufficient information in the summary on what they intend to do with the money and how it will be spent. Whether the group plans to report back to the Assembly to provide an update on what they have done with the funding.

#### **Response**

The Cllr responding to the query raised on the Consortium bid provided the explanation that given the lack of time to allow groups to prepare and work together on a wider basis, the decision was taken to submit a bid on behalf of the consortium in case there was insufficient bids to cover the total ward allocation. If funding is approved, the group would act as custodian of the fund and will consult properly and agree a process of allocation. The consortium will work together to look for where there are needs or gaps in services, sharing intelligence, a process which will enable them to catch things as they come up and allocate funding accordingly to address those needs as they arise during the 2 years lifespan of the NCIL funding.

- A query raised on the recommended bid for the Baseline Report to improve active travel safety in Grove Park and Lee Green. A notion that this element of safer travel should have been covered through the Low Traffic Neighbourhood programme instead of the NCIL fund.
- Comment - A resident expressed disappointment to see that the bid for a youth project from South London Counselling & Support Services was the only bid not recommended. Saw this as a good bid specifically aimed at providing much needed support to young people.

#### **Response**

On the non-recommended youth project, Cllrs and Officers both looked at the details of the project and it was clear in the application that it was a borough wide proposal which didn't target Lee Green resident sufficiently. Given that Lee Green had received relatively small amount of funding compared to other wards it was therefore impossible to recommend this bid.

**Clarification** was sought on what would happen to the fund where a project does not go ahead or where it is deemed not viable for delivery. Officers will liaise with colleagues and provide a response at the next Assembly meeting.

**No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers**

<b>NCIL: Lewisham Central ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Patrick Codd
Attendance	85
No. of Recommended Projects	11
Date of meeting	1 <sup>st</sup> February 2022

### **Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- A question was asked by a resident about the formal process for NCIL.  
**Response**
- Officer provided the following information in respect of the process that will follow the agreement of the recommendations by the Assembly as follows:
  - All the agreed bids will be put forward to Mayor and Cabinet on 9<sup>th</sup> of March for final approval.
  - Applicants would be notified of the final outcome of their application after M&C meeting.
  - A standard grant agreement will be drawn up for each organisation where the Council is not the delivery agent.
  - Where the council is the delivery agent, further discussion will be had with the applicant and the relevant department about how deliverable each aspect of the project are in consultation with technicians and designers. This will apply to items such as tree planting and highway projects.
- A question was submitted asking how many people were informed about the NCIL funding and how the funding opportunity was advertised to residents across borough.  
**Response**  
In responding to the question about how the funding was advertised officer provided the explanation the all of the Council communications media was used to publicise the opportunity including via the Lewisham Central Assembly mailing list. Information was also sent out via all of the council's partner organisations and leaflets posted to every household in the borough.
- A resident who submitted a proposal for a Safer Crossing in Hither Green and had not been recommended commented that some of the items in the bid

supported some of the recommendations made in retaining the Low Traffic Neighbourhood along areas that border Hither Green. The resident asked if there was another pot of funding that the council could access to deliver some of the safer crossing projects specified in the bid.

**Response**

- In responding to the question on the Low Traffic Neighbourhood Scheme Cllr Codd explained the reasoning behind some of the decision taken by the council to retain the revised LTN scheme, adding new factor such as school streets, changes to some of the junctions in the scheme to become camera controlled and other measures affecting surrounding areas. He further explained that project such as the ones specified in the Safer Crossing proposal tends to be funded through TFL funding and this isn't secured at the moment. Although councillors and officers did acknowledged there is a good justification for need for these works in Hither Green however, restriction on the budget has influenced some of the decisions from taking this project forward. A discussion will be had with the relevant Council department making a case for this item to be revisited at a later date.
- A comment was made by a resident querying that if the majority of the NCIL funding has come from developments in the centre of Lewisham/Lewisham Station, and why many of the recommended projects are not located in this area. They have observed that the area is turning into a concrete jungle, densely built up and very unwelcoming, particularly the current state of Confluence Park was a raised as a concern. There was a request to prioritise this area by improving the landscaping.

**Response**

On the comment about lack of projects to mitigate the impact of development in centre of Lewisham and current state of Confluence Park, officers responded that they have taken note of the points made and that there would be opportunities for future funding to spend on improving these areas. There was also a recognition that more targeted engagement is needed to engage the newer communities around the centre of Lewisham who presently may not know what they need or want.

On the issue raised around the regular maintenance of Confluence Park, officer clarified that the maintenance of the park lies with the developers. Officers will liaise with planning colleagues to pressurise developers to ensure that all requirements are delivered on their areas of maintenance that are their responsibilities.

- A question was asked about whether there are other funding sources would be made available this year for groups to deliver events to celebrate the Queen's Platinum Jubilee

**Response**

Funding for Queen's Platinum Jubilee – officers confirmed that are no specific funding currently available for this. However, officers are aware of a working

group that is putting on various activities. They can find out their contact details and pass it on.

- A comment from an organisation whose bid was recommended highlighted the impact that Covid had on the people they have supported through the food bank at the Salvation Army in Lewisham. They were happy to see their bid recommended for funding and this will enable them to offer their services to more people in the community.
- A resident asked if there was a breakdown of the cost for the Ennersdale Road proposal. They questioned whether NCIL funding can be used in this way and if it was more appropriate that the project be funded from elsewhere to allow the funding recommended for this project to be spent on other non-recommended schemes.

**Response**

Breakdown of cost of project – officers explained that it is too early to get an actual break down of cost. What would have happened at the initial stage was that the resident who submitted the bid would have received advice from the relevant council department about the rough costing of the project prior to submitting their proposal

Further explanation was provided that the funding requested was to conduct a feasibility report to look into the design of parking and some funding for implementation of it in consultation with traffic team. Evidence provided in the application showed there was significant community support for the project. The application was supported by a petition signed by 105 residents who were concerned that the street in its current form is dangerous to pedestrians. In view of this, NCIL funding can be used to deliver projects which benefits the community in this way, where budget constraints does not allow for the council to act upon them. Following the final approval by Mayor and Cabinet a discussion will be had with colleagues from highways team and the resident who submitted the proposal on the feasibility of the delivery

- Comment from a resident who said they were delighted that the Council are recommending funding for a new playground in Lewisham Park. They said this is greatly needed and when it happens it will make a big difference to the local community.

**No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers**

<b>NCIL: New Cross ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Brenda Dacres
Attendance	42

No. of Recommended Projects	15
Date of meeting	22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2022

**Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- Query as to why Moonshot was the only project to receive part funding.

**Response**

Officer confirmed that there were three part-funded projects. This is due the desire to fund as many projects as possible. Officer added that sometimes there were parts of bids that were not feasible and therefore we wanted to make sure that this didn't preclude from being funded.

- Comment was made regarding the access points to Hatcham especially via Cold Blow Lane and Harts Lane. It was stated that the community wanted to discourage fly tipping in the area which had become constant. The comment also addressed the need for a ramp for cyclists to access cycling route 1, as well as cyclists sharing the footpath with pedestrians which has become very dangerous for walkers.

**Response**

- Cllr outlined that the tunnel at Cold Blow Lane has been an ongoing issue for some time however feedback from Highways on the proposal to make it one-way is that this could have the impact of making traffic faster through the tunnel. It was raised that there had previously been the suggestion of traffic lights here as well as improved lighting through the tunnel.

An officer stated that they were part of the panel that examined the highways bids across the borough. It was the deliverability of the scheme within the two year window of the fund that influenced the decision as the proposal is a complex scheme that need to be considered in tandem with other proposals for the area. As part of the New Cross regeneration there are several scheme being developed to look at the impact of opening up other arches in the Surrey Canal Triangle and adding that any scheme requires complex modelling on the potential impact.

Hatcham Society would like to use some of the money to improve access for wheelchair user at Harts Lane. It was explained that, as this is on a red route, the responsibility for the pavement is likely to be TfL so it would be their responsibility to improve it and therefore the NCIL cannot be used but this will be raised through Highways.

**No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers**

<b>NCIL: Perry Vale ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr John Paschoud
Attendance	60

No. of Recommended Projects	6
Date of meeting	24 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

**Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- A question was raised as to the lack of any Ward NCIL funding recommendation for traffic calming measures in Woolstone and Cranston Roads. It was believed that this funding had been requested at Perry Vale Assembly held on 21 January 2020.

**Response**

It was clarified that the process for allocating Ward NCIL funding is a grant-making process, with a requirement to submit an application. This differs from, for example, the Assembly Funding process where projects were voted on at Assemblies. The fund was opened on 26 September 2021 and closed on 21 November, and was well publicised within wards. The council had not received any eligible bid for these traffic-related projects by the closing date. Councillors and officers are very aware of these concerns, and will continue to explore other avenues for addressing them. There will continue to be opportunities to raise and discuss these at Perry Vale ward's regular Local On-line Assemblies (LOLA's) run by councillors. Details of how to sign up for notifications of these meetings were provided in the "chat" during the meeting, and will be promoted within the ward.

**No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers**

<b>NCIL: Rushey Green ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr John Muldoon
Attendance	45
No. of Recommended Projects	9
Date of meeting	29 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

**Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- Two residents raised concerns that older elements in the community are missing out on grants. One noted that the only project that was specifically for older people was rejected. There was concern that the bias is towards younger elements in the community and older people are missing out.

### **Response**

- There was general disagreement with this point from meeting attendees with several noting in the chat that their projects supported older people and that there was a good mix of projects.

Officers and councillors assured residents that the investment in older people, as a proportion of the Main Grant had increased in this next round and with regard NCIL funding, the project that was not recommended was not able to demonstrate it was directly for Rushey Green residents and as the fund was over-subscribed, priority had to be given to projects that were more targeted at Rushey Green users. Councillors assured residents that older people activities was very important to the ward and the expectation would be that the newly funded community development worker in Rushey Green would prioritise working to engage older Rushey Green Residents in activities at the Lewisham Irish Centre and beyond.

- One resident raised concern that NCIL funding was supporting things that the council should be delivering.

### **Response**

- Officers explained that in some areas - where the council was identified as the delivery partner, it was not the council that were getting funded, they were the ones who would deliver the work as this would be the most cost effective way of delivering the project. An example of play equipment for parks was given.
- A resident felt that Brownhill road has been neglected in the NCIL funding, and this is an extremely neglected road with many vulnerable families. It was suggested that the only project that could help them had been rejected –

### **Response**

This was clarified in the room, as the project referred to had actually been recommended.

- Firstly it was noted that there had been no bids made to support work on Brownhill Road, so officers clarified that an application would have had to be made in order to recommend it.
- It was acknowledged by councillors that Brownhill road was an area in need and would be prioritised as part of the work by the newly funded Community Development worker for the Rushey Green Ward through consultation, engagement and targeted fundraising work as this was most definitely a cold spot in the ward. Councillor Walsh also provided information on current local consultation around the Catford Island private development which could impact Brownhill road. The Community Fundraiser covering 'cold spots' invested in through the Main Grants programme was also identified by officers as an opportunity to raise funds.

- Clarification was sought on the different funding stream proposed for the St Laurence Church community centre project.

**Response**

Officers confirmed that although the St Laurence heat pump air improvement quality had not been recommended for Rushey Green due to massive over subscription of the fund, it was an excellent project covering 2 wards that has been put forward to the air quality part of the NCIL fund.

**No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.**

<b>NCIL: Sydenham ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Liam Curran
Attendance	30
No. of Recommended Projects	9
Date of meeting	22 <sup>nd</sup> January 2022

**Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

- No comments or questions relating to the recommendations were raised

**No further actions were identified to be taken forwards by officers**

<b>NCIL: Telegraph Hill ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Luke Sorba
Attendance	37
No. of Recommended Projects	6
Date of meeting	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2022

**Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:**

A commitment on transparency on how the projects have been assessed and scored.

## Response

Officers explained that the reductions have been taking into account the budget on the application and identified what could be delivered with the recommended amount. Officers explained in more detail how the applications had been scored and assessed. Clarification on how the budgets were reduced and if this will still allow a proper project delivery.

### No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers

<b>NCIL: Whitefoot ward assembly summary</b>	
Chair	Cllr Jonathan Slater
Attendance	30
No. of Recommended Projects	6
Date of meeting	1 <sup>st</sup> February 2022

### Summary of questions and issues raised about recommendations:

- A number of comments welcoming support for projects particularly targeted at young people as it was felt there was a great need for this in the ward.
- There were a number of questions on the Forster Park project, including the nature of the play facilities being proposed.
- There was a further question about Forster Park in relation to the current unsatisfactory lighting in certain parts of the park.
- A representative from the Open Hither Green project explained that the project would be focused on undertaking a major community engagement exercise, particularly bearing in mind the decoration of the new ward. The project would also undertake development work at the Goldsmiths Community Centre to make it more welcoming and provide improved community facilities.

### Response and further action taken by officers

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.