

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

The Economy, Arts, Sports, and Public Realm Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes



Monday 18 November 2024

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Rory Vaughan (Chair), Liz Collins, Adam Peter Lang, Ashok Patel and Jackie Borland

Officers:

Bram Kainth, Executive Director of Place
Mark Raisbeck, Director of Public Realm
Val Birchall, Assistant Director, Cultural Services
Simon Ingyon, Assistant Director, Parks, and Leisure
Matt Paterson, Assistant Director for Spatial Planning
Charles Francis, Committee Coordinator

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrew Jones (Cabinet Member for the Economy) and Councillor Zarar Qayyum (Cabinet Member for Enterprise and Skills).

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Liz Collins and Ashok Patel.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the Economy, Arts, Sports and Public Realm Policy and Accountability Committee meeting held on 22nd July 2024 were agreed.

4. CULTURAL STRATEGY UPDATE

Val Birchall, Assistant Director, Cultural Services gave a presentation on Cultural Strategy. This update set out the progress made on the implementation of the Cultural Strategy which was adopted by Cabinet in October 2023.

The presentation drew attention to the following:

- The role of the Arts Commission in the development and delivery of the Cultural Strategy.
- A foundation of the Cultural Strategy was to establish a delivery board called a Cultural Compact. A Cultural Compact is a model promoted by Arts Council England, for a multi-stakeholder anchor network.
- The H&F Compact is called Where Culture Connects and comprises representatives from cultural venues, production companies, community, private sector, public health, education and the creative industries.
- In order to deliver the strategy, a series of related specialist groups were being established by the Compact, as set out below:
 1. Cultural Forum
 2. Destination Management Partnership
 3. Heritage Partnership
 4. Cultural & Creative Education & Skills Partnership
- The next steps:
 1. Three quick-win projects are in development for the next six months - mapping of soft and hard infrastructure for culture; a programme for primary school children, and a scheme to open up access to culture for residents through free admission.
 2. In addition, work towards a Black history museum will continue.
 3. These link directly to the strategy objectives and pick up the priorities of the Forum.
 4. The Compact, including the destination partnership, are working together to develop a public facing programme, including free events and to research feasibility of a collective funding model.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang stated he was pleased with the development of the Cultural Strategy and noted that there were numerous ongoing workstreams. He said it was important to stress the need for employment opportunities and the links these had to the Industrial Strategy.

In relation to the Cultural Forum, Councillor Adam Peter Lang noted this had been launched in October 2024 and asked when the key events were? He commented it was important the Council listened to less prominent groups and also took on board their views (especially young people). In response, Val Birchall agreed it was important to include the views of young people / hidden voices to develop the Strategy and explained that the views of the Youth Council and Youth Voice had been included in the recent BID (for the London Borough of Culture).

Councillor Jackie Borland commented she was encouraged by how ambitious the Cultural Strategy was and asked what the time frame for its implementation was. In response, Val Birchall confirmed that the Strategy was based on a 10-year framework. Some of the actions would be delivered in the short and medium term, but its overall implementation was dependant on funding and the number of partners the Council required.

Councillor Ashok Patel congratulated officers on the work of the Cultural Compact. Commenting on the Heritage Partnerships and Black History Museum, he asked if the aims of the Museum could be extended to cover Asians from 1960's, as he felt it should also cover Asian history. In response, Val Birchall listed a series of cultural venues and partnerships which had fed into the ongoing heritage work. And commented that in future, the intention was to do themed and focused work with particular groups. It was noted that the Compact was currently considering the scope and composition of the Heritage Partnership.

Councillor Rory Vaughan noted the successful summer and winter events which had taken place on King Street, and he asked how these activities, as well as using green spaces and the river creatively, might contribute to the visitor economy.

In response Val Birchall commented there were two parts to using the green spaces and delivering summer/winter events. One was about residents and the use of green spaces which ran through the strategy, and was linked to accessibility of activities. The second was about events designed to attract visitors. Val explained that the visitor Economy officer was gathering data on visitor behaviour and hotel room availability, and using this to look at the borough hotel capacity and how to draw in further numbers with specific promotional messages and new activities.

Cllr Rory Vaughan asked what the unique selling points of Hammersmith and Fulham were, as well as other areas within the borough, such as Shepherd's Bush. He asked officers to comment on co-production and also Public Health and how the health economy might be involved in culture in future, as there were strong links with Hammersmith Hospital, Charing Cross and other facilities across the borough.

In response, Val Birchall highlighted that Nikki Lang, Director of Public Health sat on the Compact. And one of the aims of the Cultural Compact was to create an environment which had wider benefits to people's mental wellbeing and also their physical well-being. Val Birchall highlighted some exemplary organisations in the borough such as Dance West working with older people, as well as a number of arts and health workstreams currently underway. In relation to co-production, Val Birchall explained that a considerable amount of Community Arts was developed in conjunction with the people who were involved, so this brought culture into communities. The Committee noted that, in future, one of the aims was to have more of a neighbourhood focus and engage more with communities to develop community- based projects.

Cllr Ashok Patel offered his congratulations on the ideas of an annual Hammersmith and Fulham award. Turning to the Appendix of the report, he noted that there was a proposal for collaborating with the Sands End Arts and Community Centre (SEACC)

to amplify opportunities there which he also supported. He asked about how he could become involved in Sands End meetings in the future.

In response, Val Birchall commented that Nina von der Werth, the Director of SEACC, would be leading conversations about future opportunities and she would be best placed to keep Councillor Patel informed of developments.

Summarising the item, the Chair, Councillor Rory Vaughan said he was encouraged by the progress that was being made. He thought there were lots of great ideas, and the Committee were glad these were being driven forwards. He asked for a further update in due course.

RESOLVED

1. For the Committee as recommended to review and comment on the report.

5. PUBLIC REALM WORKS PROCUREMENT

In the absence of Ian Hawthorn, Assistant Director Highways, Mark Raisbeck, Director of Public Realm, provided a presentation. This outlined the strategic approach being developed for a Public Realm Maintenance & Project Works Contract for all Council Public Realm works from April 2026. The presentation covered the following points:

- The scope of the Public Realm Contract -noting that it covered Highways, Parks & Consultancy Services
- The objectives of the new contract, noting it will:
 1. Align with LBHF's Low Carbon Procurement Policy.
 2. Be accessible by Highways, Parks and Housing teams for efficient procurement and delivery of works.
 3. Incorporate Social Value.
 4. Focus on Apprenticeships.
 5. Incorporate Innovation – electrification of vehicles, recycling, sustainability, decarbonisation.
 6. Deliver quality public space – in line with the Council's StreetSmart guide.
 7. Deliver against a suite of KPI's to maximise efficient delivery of the contracts.
- An overview of the Lot Structure.
- Details of the developmental timescales for the new contract.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang noted that there were two potential contract options, and he supported officer's views. Mark Raisbeck confirmed that a Transport for London framework contract could be used as a fallback position for highways works, but this was not the preferred option. In relation to drainage, Councillor Adam Peter Lang suggested that this was an area that needed to be looked at differently (within the new contract) in future, as residents had expressed their concerns on this to him.

He also highlighted future employment opportunities and suggested that each contract winner should be asked to commit to a specific number of apprenticeships.

Acknowledging that the Policy and Accountability Committee meeting was not the right forum, Councillor Adam Peter Lang highlighted he had received a number of complaints about Lime and Forrest e-bikes and he asked if it was possible that a pan-London approach could be taken to regulation.

Turning to public realm issues, and specifically street lighting, Councillor Adam Peter Lang explained how this impacted on residents. He highlighted how improved street lighting could have a positive impact on the night-time economy and also improve public safety.

In relation to drainage, Mark Raisbeck commented that the work officers were doing on Suds and flood alleviation was very important and the Council required a contractor that could deliver and communicate with the residents effectively, which was one of the softer sides officers were looking for in the procurement process.

With regards to street lighting, Mark Raisbeck commented that the borough had some excellent levels of street lighting and, generally speaking, the Council exceeded the minimum standards. However, there were always some locations where this could be improved. He highlighted that officers were currently doing extensive surveys across parks and open spaces to ensure lighting was of an appropriate standard and again, ensuring the right contractor, with the right skills could deliver the contract was very important to the Council.

With regards to apprenticeships, Councillors noted that officers wished to explore opportunities with not just young people, but for a whole range of people within local communities. And in relation to e-bikes, Mark Raisbeck confirmed that officers were working very hard to try and manage these in a more appropriate way. Councillor Liz Collins echoed the Committee's concerns about e-bikes and in particular that there wasn't a telephone number residents could use for these to be removed when they had been discarded in front of residents' driveways. In response, Bram Kainth, Executive Director of Place explained that the Council had advertised a contact number to report issues, had removed bikes and also fined some operators, but this was not a sustainable approach. Bram Kainth agreed a pan-London approach to e-bikes was needed in the future.

Collin Liz Collins asked about the co-ordination of street works to ensure that residents were kept informed and steps were taken to minimise disruption to highways. In response, Mark Raisbeck provided details of the ongoing work by the co-ordination team and liaison with outside agencies to address residents' queries.

Councillor Jackie Borland noted that the previous Highways Contract had awarded five out of six of the lots to FM Conway, but now the Council was considering splitting these up. She asked about compliance to industry standards and which approach had become the norm. In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed the Council had done some benchmarking and looked at what other Local Authorities were doing. Some had decided to adopt one provider which provided all services, whereas others had selected up to ten different contractors, each one providing different

services. Based on the challenges both approaches posed, Mark Raisbeck confirmed that the Council was aiming to take a middle ground approach which offered flexibility. He confirmed that the market engagement work was going to be the key, because ultimately the Council wanted competition and a sustainable contract.

Councillor Jackie Borland asked about the rationale behind splitting the lighting and highway contractor as she felt a joined-up approach was preferable. In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed the Council might end up with one provider for both, which we have now, but the highways contractor, sub-contracts the lighting work because it's a specialist area. By allowing separate bids for the different elements at this stage it gives the specialist lighting providers the opportunity to tender independent of the larger highway contractors.

Councillor Ashok Patel asked several questions. Firstly, he noted that the Council had been working with FM Conways since 2017 and asked for performance information. Secondly, he supported the idea of amalgamating three contracts into one; but asked what the likely savings would be. Finally, in the selection and award criteria, he noted that the criteria were going to be based on price, quality and social value. He suggested that price was the most important factor given the cost-conscious times.

In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed in relation to costs, that prices had changed considerably recently, both in terms of workforce and materials and the Council anticipated costs to rise significantly. This was why officers were trying to expand the scope of the contract, to make it as attractive as possible to potential bidders.

Mark Raisbeck provided details of the reasons why Westminster had chosen to withdraw from a joint procurement of the contract with LBHF. In relation to the selection criteria, he confirmed the standard approach was a 60% quality, 40% price but that could be reviewed following market engagement. It was noted that social value was included within the 60%.

In relation to the timetable, Councillor Ashok Patel asked if this would be brought back to the Committee. In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed that officers would be pleased to provide a further update in due course. Bram Kainth added the caveat, that when the procurement exercise had begun, officers could only report back at the end of the exercise to protect the process.

Councillor Rory Vaughan noted the contract would last for seven years, to give contractors a certain length of time to recoup fixed costs and to make it attractive as a contract bid. He asked what ability officers would have to negotiate, or to manage out if there was a problem with one of the contractors. And also, he noted that there was going to be a wider range of contractors, which would increase the pressure on officers to manage those contracts, especially with specialist contracts in some areas.

In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed that in relation to the management of contractors, the Council was currently managing four contractors, and it would be surprising if the Council ended up with too many more. He explained how efficiencies

could be made and cited street lighting and lighting in parks being provided by one contractor as an example. Officers felt they had struck the right balance between the number of specialisms in contract along with the number of Lots. He explained that the planned and reactive maintenance lot was a key aspect of the contract, which would apply across all those services of parks, as well as highways for example, so if there was a need to react quickly, then one contractor could address the work rather than multiple contractors being involved.

Councillor Rory Vaughan asked about key performance indicators on responsiveness, and when issues were raised by residents, such as lighting, how officers would measure the response and also build this into the contract. In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed the Council currently had a monitoring regime and officers were in the process of looking at how this could be improved. He cited the fixing of potholes and complaints data from residents (prompting action) as examples of where the Council used a system called Confirm which provided the Council with data in terms of the contractor's performance. Mark Raisbeck confirmed that officers were constantly evaluating data and response times with a view to learning and improving in the future.

Councillor Rory Vaughan asked what the intended extra benefits of the contract would be, in terms of reacting more quickly or maintaining highways more effectively for example. And in relation to the SUDS scheme, for example, how often this was used to stop flooding in terms of climate change and the need for contractors to react on a more regular basis in the future (as the climate became warmer and wetter).

In response, Mark Raisbeck confirmed that officers would be looking at some of the wider objectives around the climate change agenda, such as how the contractors could reduce their emissions perhaps by moving to electric vehicles, looking at their general sustainability approach, and the recycling of materials to reduce the carbon footprint. He explained that officers would be looking for effective and efficient delivery at a value price. Further steps included improving communications with residents so that they knew when works were starting and engaging with residents when work was due to be undertaken.

Summing up, Councillor Rory Vaughan thanked officers for providing a summary of the proposed contract and the steps which were being taken to provide better and consistent services to residents. He explained that the Committee would be interested to see how the bids were received and how matters developed in the future.

Resolved –

That the Committee to note and comment on the paper and presentation.

6. REVIEW OF PARKS SATISFACTION SURVEY 2024

Simon Ingyon, Assistant Director, Parks, and Leisure, gave a presentation on the results of the annual Parks Satisfaction Survey via the council's 'Have Your Say' platform. The presentation outlined the key results and the next steps towards bringing forward a Parks Improvement Plan to a future cycle of the Committee.

The presentation drew attention to the following:

- An overview of the Parks survey, when it was conducted, its duration, the number of responses received, and the parks included.
- The key findings:
 1. Overall Satisfaction: 86.3% (up from 69% in 2023)
 2. Maintenance Satisfaction: 83% (up from 61% in 2023)
 3. Safety: 65.7% (down from 73% in 2023)
 4. Cleanliness: 80% (up from 67% in 2023)
 5. Quality: 81% satisfaction
- The frequency of visits: travel mode and reasons for visiting parks.
- Themes including: desired improvements, park features and facilities, accessibility / signage and infrastructure.
- Details of future actions.

The Chair thanked Simon Ingyon for his presentation and congratulated officers on the increased satisfaction levels with parks.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang commented on the variety of green and open spaces within the borough and highlighted how important it was that the Council maintained and continued to improve the facilities in parks. He then raised a number of issues including toilet facilities, the importance and value of litter-picking and the need for good and appropriate lighting (in parks). Further points included the need to ensure parks were as accessible as possible, (as many residents did not have an outdoor space or garden of their own) and also the topic of anti-social behaviour. While Councillor Adam Peter Lang commended the work of the Law Enforcement Team (LET); he suggested there was more that the Council could do on this front. He also mentioned the actions of some volunteer groups in Ravenscourt Park working in the boundaries of the park and highlighted this should be encouraged to bring about improvements in other parks.

In response, Simon Ingyon confirmed that as part of the social value of the IdVerde contract, they were meant to utilise a considerable number of volunteering hours in the borough's parks and open spaces to supplement and support the core contract they were employed to deliver. He explained that, as part of this process, IdVerde did use corporate volunteers and other community groups who conducted weekly or monthly litter-picks. Simon Ingyon also confirmed that the Community Payback Team were also deployed to ensure they were carrying out some manual work in parks and open spaces with activities such as painting railings and scrubbing them down, litter picking or clearing areas to ensure that people could enjoy them more.

With regards to anti-social behaviour, Simon Ingyon agreed that much of this was perception, as the visitor data showed that of all those persons who visited or went through Parks day in day out, only a small percentage experienced anti-social behaviour. However, if you were to witness an incident this could colour someone's judgement about parks overall. Simon Ingyon confirmed more could be done in

terms of demonstrating how many hours the LET were active in parks and open spaces.

In relation to lighting, it was noted that Parks and Open Spaces were responsible for about 700 columns, and they were currently working with the Highways Team to evaluate these and update them to LEDs which were more cost effective. Simon Ingyon highlighted the compromise which needed to be struck in lighting parks in terms of public safety / the use of well-lit sports facilities, as well as the competing needs of the local ecology. Turning to litter picking, Simon Ingyon highlighted that in addition to the volunteering work and also the work of the Council's contractors, there were National campaigns run by Keep Britain Tidy Britain who also ran the Green Flag standard. It was noted that the Council currently had 21 Green Flags for its parks and open spaces and there was a commitment to increasing this number in future. Finally, with regards to toilets, officers acknowledged that they were one of the most requested amenities, especially if there was an aim to encourage people to use parks for longer than an hour. Simon Ingyon confirmed that the Council was looking to work with other providers, such as local cafes to increase access to toilet facilities. The Committee noted that providing toilets was not cheap to operate, manage and maintain and the Council was being proactive about finding other ways of providing these, such as signposting to where toilet schemes were located.

In relation to the Parks Survey consultation, Councillor Jackie Borland asked why this had been conducted in the middle of summer holidays when people were either away or were busy with children. She suggested that in future, an alternative time might be September, as people would have just spent the summer months using parks and open spaces. She noted that it was disappointing the survey had found people felt less safe in Parks and suggested there was an opportunity to improve lighting in some parks to help people feel safer.

Turning to the usage of Parks, Councillor Jackie Borland commented that resident emails / feedback suggested that residents would like to see less events in parks generally.

In response, Simon Ingyon confirmed that the Parks Satisfaction Survey was launched when it was, to coincide with National Parks Week, which was the last week in July as officers thought this might raise the profile of the survey. As well as outlining the timeframe of the survey, he highlighted that the Council also used multiple e-newsletter updates and follow ups. In relation to events, Simon Ingyon confirmed that a specific question around events was not asked in the survey, and attending events in parks was a popular reason for going. However, it was challenging to manage and maintain parks to high standards, and events alongside Sports income was one of the ways that officers helped supplement budgets that were largely expenditure based.

With regards to lighting, he confirmed it was striking a balance between safety and addressing ecological considerations and there was a need to ensure that all current lighting was updated and upgraded.

Councillor Ashok Patel echoed the Committee's concerns about safety and, in particular, using Eel Brook Common. He suggested there should be provision for a

park warden, as well as for this to be augmented by more CCTV coverage in certain locations. Turning to the survey results, Councillor Ashok Patel noted that the feedback was mainly from white backgrounds and there was only one response from an Asian British background and one response from black British background was received. He also noted that the demographic data showed that parks were less attractive to young people. And finally, he asked what was being done to encourage local schools to use parks.

In relation to the demographics of the people that responded to the questionnaire, Simon Ingyon confirmed that further engagement with young people was required. He explained that the survey did not tell the Council who was actually going to parks, but rather those residents which had the inclination to answer the satisfaction survey. If young people had not fed into the survey, then the Council needed to find other ways of engaging with young people, such as through the Youth Council, to ensure that parks and open spaces remained popular and visited by them. This point also rang true on Councillor Patel's comments on diversity to ensure that everyone was encouraged to complete the satisfaction survey. Simon Ingyon commented, nationally Asian populations did not visit parks and open spaces as much and more work was required to understand why this group was not engaging with the Council. With regards to the proposal to introduce a night-time parks warden, Simon Ingyon confirmed that this was the role of LET as well as their wider responsibilities. It was a question of whether Parks and Leisure could work with the LET to ensure their night teams were targeting those very popular commuter routes, such as Eel Brook Common, so residents saw a presence there in the evening and felt more reassured.

In relation to the point about schools, Simon Ingyon confirmed that the survey was targeted at individuals rather than specific stakeholders which paid to use or hire park facilities. He provided details of the Tiny Forest initiative, use of woodland areas and outdoor classrooms, so that children had the opportunity to learn about nature, as many schools in the borough did not have natural areas within their own school footprints because of their location in an inner London Borough.

Councillor Liz Collins highlighted that a few residents had contacted her about the small playgrounds in Ravenscourt Park and said these were not well maintained. She also felt that there needed to be additional communications so that people knew how they could use the park and what was interesting about it. She also highlighted the issue of female safety in certain green spaces such as Eel Brook Common.

In response, Simon Ingyon explained that officers were aware that the playgrounds in some of the parks and open spaces did not meet the standards the Council aspired to, which was why a detailed review of all the boroughs playgrounds in the thirty-five Parks or Open Spaces was being conducted. Officers would bring back an improvement plan to the committee in due course. It was noted that four inspections a year were carried out and officers had increased the maintenance costs for parks and open spaces. In relation to the safety concerns, Simon Ingyon echoed the points made in response to Councillor Patel. He also highlighted that there was some finance available from the Improvement Budget to look at the LED lighting to ensure areas had the right Lux levels so that people hopefully felt safer.

The Chair, Councillor Rory Vaughan, explained that one of the complaints he had heard and also observed was the late locking of Ravenscourt Park which had safety implications. He asked for this to be checked with the LET. In terms of infrastructure in parks, he confirmed that he supported the idea of more water fountains in parks, as well as encouraging residents to use refillable bottles. He commended the redevelopment of Hammersmith Park in terms of the basketball court, tennis courts and outdoor gym and hoped other parks could be upgraded. Councillor Rory Vaughan asked how well outside gyms were used as the survey had requested more of them.

In terms of parks signage, Councillor Rory Vaughan noted this had been upgraded and now gave pertinent information about individual parks. With regards to biodiversity, he commented that while this worked well in most cases, there was a recent trend of grounds maintenance staff mowing over newly emerging crocuses and asked that springtime mowing could be integrated within future contracts to avoid this from reoccurring. With regards to activities in parks, the Chair highlighted the increased popularity of padel tennis and asked officers to explore ways of increasing the number of public courts.

In response, Simon Ingyon confirmed that the point about the locking time of parks would be raised with Parks regular meetings with the Law Enforcement Team (LET). He explained that locking times remained somewhat fluid in the evenings as this depended on where their resources were being drawn, but appreciated that if parks were left open too long then this might cause further instances for them to report. Moving forwards, he commented that there were opportunities to improve the signage in the popular parks, as well as on the information available on the website. He explained that at present, the Council only had detailed information on about ten parks and this needed to be increased to cover all the green flags initially, before moving on to the remaining sites.

In relation to drinking fountains, Simon Ingyon confirmed that the standard one that the Council provided now included a water bottle filler. Dog bowls were also provided. Simon Ingyon explained that officers did not have detailed feedback on the new outdoor gym in Hammersmith Park at this stage, but there had been no negative feedback since its installation and it appeared to be popular and well used. Outdoor Gyms were also being used to help dissuade or move on antisocial behaviour in some parks and open spaces because they brought a number of different users to the site.

With regards to biodiversity, Simon Ingyon assured the Committee that officers were aware flora and fauna needed to last its life cycle so that bees, butterflies and other fertilising insects were supported. He confirmed that officers were in the process of conducting a detailed review of paddle opportunities in the borough, and he explained that the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) had just launched their own padel strategy which included increasing the current 300 courts nationwide to 3,000 in the next 5 to 10 years. He explained the reasons why padel tennis was so popular and provided details of the partnerships working across borough to increase its uptake.

Closing the item, Councillor Rory Vaughan was encouraged by the response to the Parks Satisfaction Survey. He underlined the need to improve public safety through

better lighting and increased CCTV. He noted the point which had been made about the diversity of the response and the need to capture everyone's views going forwards. The initiatives to increase access to public toilets, encourage volunteering, especially corporate volunteering and work to promote sports and physical activity were welcomed. The Committee looked forward to a further update in the next 6 to 12 months.

Resolved –

That the Committee to note and comment on the report.

7. NEW LOCAL PLAN FOR HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM

Matt Paterson, Assistant Director for Spatial Planning, gave a verbal update on the New Local Plan for Hammersmith and Fulham. It was noted that this will need to provide for the development needs of the borough, including housing and employment needs, for the 15-year period from 2025/26 to 2040/41. The update provided details on the process to be followed in preparing the new Local Plan and the likely key issues a new Local Plan for the borough will need to address.

Key aspects of the update included:

- The key stages in preparing a New Local Plan:
 1. Evidence gathering, Draft Plan Stage, Pre-Submission Draft Plan Stage, Conformity with London Plan, Submission to the Secretary of State, Independent Examination in Public.
 2. The Inspector's Report and Adoption of Local Plan.
 3. And following the implementation of the Local Plan, the Council must monitor the performance of the policies and prepare an Annual Monitoring Report.

- Key matters for the Local Plan including:
 1. Housing need and land supply.
 2. Taking action on climate change mitigation and adaptation.
 3. Supporting town and local centres as they adapt to change.
 4. Increasing employment and jobs.
 5. Protecting heritage and designing high-quality safe, accessible, and inclusive communities.
 6. Increasing biodiversity and the quality of open spaces.
 7. Reducing the need to travel and promoting sustainable travel and
 8. Securing new social and community infrastructure.

The Chair, Councillor Rory Vaughan, thanked Matt Paterson for setting out the framework and timeline for the development of the new Local Plan.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang commented that the Local Plan was a complex overarching framework which integrated the Council's other plans and policies, such as the innovative Industrial Strategy. As such, he said it was important that residents

understood how their feedback would be used in consultation phases as the New Plan developed.

Councillor Adam Peter Lang asked about Hammersmith and Fulham's housing targets, as set by the London Plan, in comparison with other London boroughs. In response, Matt Paterson confirmed that every London borough had a very different housing figure to each other. Hammersmith and Fulham's strategic housing requirement was very high, as a local Authority in Hammersmith it was much higher than elsewhere, and this was primarily based around housing affordability. Historically, Hammersmith and Fulham had been penalised as its housing was not affordable and therefore the borough needed to provide more. In Matt Paterson's view, the borough had reached a crossroads in that it relied heavily on the turnover of land on brownfield sites coming forward to meet its housing targets and the borough only had a finite number of brownfield sites.

Matt Paterson explained there were a number of strategies such as the Industrial Strategy, Cultural Strategy and Open Space Strategy, and the Local Plan did take account of all of these. It also looked at how the Council could implement them through the Local Plan to deliver growth and change over the next 15 years.

As a long-term resident, Councillor Liz Collins asked how officers intended to balance the delivery of the Local Plan with the social implications of what had occurred in the borough over the last 30 years. In response, Matt Paterson explained that the Council had a strategic housing requirement and a number, but then officers used the Housing Strategy to deduce the mix of housing that was required. So, to address social inequality, the needs of the Housing Strategy were fed into Planning Policy.

Matt Paterson remarked it was a balancing act between how much more housing could be accommodated in the borough due to the unaffordability of housing and high land values. And the tension that at a time of high land values, this also drove considerable benefit for the Council through developer contributions.

Councillor Ashok Patel summarised his understanding of how the Local Plan came into being, followed by a public consultation. He asked who the stakeholders were and which interest groups were going to be involved. His question stemmed from trying to understand what the aim of the London Plan was, such as the redistribution resources to local authorities in London. In relation to the public consultation, he felt that if this was just 6 weeks, and the consultation period fell over the summer holidays, then the consultation period should be reviewed.

In response, Matt Paterson confirmed that the Council did not have to abide by the 6-week period and it also intended to do a considerable amount of informal work to augment the formal consultation. As the Local Plan would affect every resident in the borough, everyone would have a vested interest in it. Matt Paterson provided details on which groups would be consulted, and the work being done with Digital Services to turn the three-hundred-page Local Plan into bite sizes (as well as facilitate feedback) so it was more accessible to residents / interest groups. He provided details on the consultation process with the Mayor of London, Secretary of State and

how the Local Plan addressed the borough's growth and development needs for the future.

Councillor Jackie Borland commented that how the Local Plan was packaged for public consultation was very important. She said the scope and potential impact of a project like the Local Plan was overwhelming. She urged officers to think about the importance of communities and have these in the forefront of people's mind, rather than simply aspire to hitting housing and density targets.

In response, Matt Paterson explained that the Council recognised those points which was why Spatial Planning had been moved from the Economy Directorate to Place. This meant that everyone who was responsible for communities had been drawn together under the Place umbrella.

Councillor Rory Vaughan highlighted the influence of government planning strategies, and asked how the timing and ramifications of these would impact on the Local Plan. In response, Matt Paterson confirmed that there was no perfect time to action a local plan review as it was inevitable that something would happen in the course of the next two and a half years which would prompt the Council to reassess its direction of travel. The Mayor of London for example would be formulating his Plan, so the Council would need to be mindful of those proposals.

Matt Paterson underlined that it was important that as the Council progressed its Local Plan, this was evidence based. He explained there was scope to depart from National policy and the London Plan if there was local evidence to support the Council's position. Closing the item, the Chair, Councillor Rory Vaughan, highlighted that the Committee would be interested how other strategies fed into the Local Plan. And how diverse factors such as: land availability, health implications and infrastructure, the timetable and consultation period, as well as National Planning Policy and the London Plan would all feed into the process over the next couple of years.

Resolved –

That the Committee to note and comment on the report.

Meeting started: 7.00 pm

Meeting ended: 9.50 pm

Chair

Contact officer: Charles Francis
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 07776 672945
E-mail: Charles.Francis@lbhf.gov.uk