

LONDON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

NOTES OF THE 14 SEPTEMBER 2005 MEETING

Present:

Samantha Heath	Mayor's Representative, Co-chair
Pamela Castle	Environmental Law Foundation, Co-chair
Nigel Bell	Imperial College
Shaun McCarthy	BAA
Craig Cordice	One Spare Chair
Dinah Cox	Race on the Agenda
Ranjit Baxi	JandH Sales International
Dr Robin Stott	Consultant Physician
Peter Head	Arup
David Fell	Brook Lyndhurst
Penny Shepherd	UK Social Investment Forum
Sue Riddlestone	BioRegional
Mike Tuffrey	London Assembly

Observer:

Penny Bramwell	Government Office for London
Mark Roberts	TfL

Secretariat:

Paula Hirst	GLA Policy Support Unit
Emma Synnott	GLA Policy Support Unit
Jane Anson	GLA Administrative support

Also in attendance

Shirley Rodrigues (part)	GLA Director of Policy and Partnerships
Jane Carlsen (part)	GLA SDS
Yvonne Rydin (part)	London School of Economics
Adarsh Varma (part)	GLA Economics
Mike Guy (part)	London School of Economics
John Barrett (part)	Stockholm Environment Institute (York)
Simon Lewis (part)	World Wildlife Foundation

Apologies: Barry Broe, Simon Woolley, Ros Dunn, Joanne Wade, Chris Birks, June Barnes, Andrew Judge, Paul de Zylva

The meeting was preceded by an 'innovation' hour.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Samantha Heath chaired today's meeting. The Commission offered congratulations to Simon Woolley on the birth of his baby.

2. Declarations of interest

None reported

3. Minutes of the last meeting held on 12 May 2005

Notes of the last meeting agreed as a true record.

In relation to the decision at the last meeting to identify lead Commissioners for key Mayoral strategies, there was a question as to whether this was now necessary given the establishment of sub-groups.

It was agreed that the Executive Group would consider whether lead Commissioners are still required for Mayoral strategies, now that there is a system of sub-groups in place.

4. National Strategy Update and progress on review

Penny Bramwell gave a presentation of the strategy's key announcements at a national and regional level. A number of questions related to the recommendations put forward by GoL were posed for Commissioners to consider. In particular, the establishment of a LSDC working group to contribute towards taking forward the strategy in London.

Discussion occurred on the following:

- Whether an Integrated Regional Strategy would have the 'teeth' that a statutory planning mechanism such as the London Plan has;
- Whether the review of regional arrangements would effectively reflect the fact that 'one size does not fit all' by recognising the need for flexibility;
- How the LSDC can show leadership by assisting Government to create appropriate guidelines to facilitate good practice at regional/national level;
- Whether it would be useful for the LSDC to undertake a gap analysis on the London Plan indicating where it would meet the conditions of an IRS and where it would not. It was noted that the national strategy does not cover a significant number of issues that are a core focus of the LSDC through its Framework;
- Whether there were some of the national priorities contained in the national strategy which the LSDC would not pursue because they are being pursued by other London bodies – e.g. 3 and 4;
- Whether using case studies to promote how London has effectively embedded sustainable development through its strategies and the London Plan. For example, a summary of how the London Olympic Bid was carried out could be used to convey this message across.

It was agreed that of the four national objectives contained in the National Strategy, objectives one and four were relevant for the Commission to engage with, given that other bodies in London had primary responsibility for taking forward objectives 2 and 3.

It was agreed that the Executive Group would take forward this piece of work, bearing in mind that the Commission is in a good position to demonstrate nationally how a regional body that has advanced experience in engaging with regional structures around sustainable development can work effectively in this task.

In relation to the question of whether London could or should adopt an IRS approach, it was agreed that the London Plan acts as a quasi IRS and that a gap analysis of how the London Plan responds across the four national objectives will highlight if there are areas which need to be addressed. It was agreed that the planning and development sub group would take on this work.

It was agreed that case studies of how London has effectively embedded sustainable development into its processes and what impact this has had would provide an excellent

way of showing leadership at a national level. It was agreed that the executive group would consider this option.

Action:

- The Executive Group to consider the recommendations put forward by GoL and how to take forward engagement on objectives one and four of the national strategy.
- To invite presentations on priority areas that are currently being attended to by other interested bodies thus avoiding duplication on the Commission's part - objectives 2 and 3. (Secretariat)
- The Planning and Development subgroup to consider carrying out a gap analysis of the London Plan to determine where it meets the conditions of an IRS.
- In addition to broader issues considered by the Executive Group, the Promotion sub-group to take forward the 4th objective by promoting the Framework.

5. Work and sub-group programme

Commission agreed the work programme.

Feedback from Subgroups:

Promotions subgroup – It was noted that there needed to be consideration of what language to use in promoting sustainable development in London in terms of whether the terminology of the national strategy is used, or the London Framework. It was agreed to ask the Executive Group to provide advice to the Commission on the terminology used in relation to the Framework and the National Strategy.

Action: Executive Sub-group

Olympic subgroup – Pamela Castle said that the subgroup would be adopting an early arms length-monitoring role and wants an immediate input into the procurement process as work has already started on the procurement of contracts. The sub-group had arranged to meet with David Lunts to discuss arrangements for engaging with the processes that were being put in place in relation to the Games.

Planning and Development subgroup – It was noted that the sub-group had met on 8th September and had agreed to review the list of issues that the GLA is considering in its revision of the London Plan. All Commissioners are welcome to contribute to comments on the issues which have been circulated

Action:

- Secretariat to collate comments from Commissioners on issues to be addressed by the London Plan Review.

The SPG for sustainable construction – checklist is out for consultation. All welcome to engage in consultation process in the next two to three weeks.

GLA subgroup to meet on 21 September.

Action:

- DF and PB to give a presentation on the London Food Strategy.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for their support in revising the work programme.

6. Report on Assembly Scrutiny – deferred

7. Dates of future Commission meetings

Forthcoming 13 December, 10 to 1pm City Hall

Provisional dates: 16 March and 15 June 2006

8. Foot printing presentations and discussion

The SEI foot printing methodology was presented by John Barrett (Stockholm Environmental Institute) and Simon Lewis (WWF). Yvonne Rydin explained the LSE project to analyse the impact of the SPG on sustainable design and construction in London by using of REAP (Resource and Energy Analysis Programme).

Discussion followed on how foot printing could further the work of the Commission/GLA. This included:

- Whether it would be sensible for London to have a way of engaging with the footprinting work occurring around the country, possibly through the SCNet.
- Queried how this tool could link to policy decision.
- How footprinting can be engaged with by the business sector, particularly in terms of linking its modelling to financial outcomes. It was noted that the tool is linked to economic models and therefore further analysis would be required to link it with data from environmental models.
- It was noted that the danger with the tool is that it does not take into account the social implications or the social cost of the outcomes which it identifies as the 'best case'. It was agreed that this needed to be carefully considered particularly when considering the disparity of resources available to different communities.
- It was noted that the outcomes of REAP modelling would ideally be accompanied by a social commentary associated with the analysis of these issues.
- There was a question about how sophisticated the model is and whether it has built in safety nets?

Simon Lewis explained that the modelling system is quantitative and use of the tool is a measure of the bio capacity of the planet. It is also very flexible as there is much scope for changing the data entered into the model.

Action:

It was agreed that the REAP model would be referred to the GLA for consideration in the future. Outcome to be reported through the GLA Group sub-group.

It was noted that there was some interest in the LSDC connecting nationally on the work being conducted on footprinting.

End of Meeting
