

**LONDON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

**Full Commission Meeting**

**Friday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2009, 10-1pm**

**City Hall, Committee Room 2**

## **Minutes**

**Present:** John Plowman (Chair), Piers Williamson, Paul de Zylva, Mike Tuffrey, Samantha Heath, Penny Bramwell, Alison Barnes, Adrian Gurney, Chris Church, Richard Stephenson, Patrick Feehily, Nusrat Yousuf, Bryony Mathie.

**Apologies:** Sue Riddlestone, Shaun McCarthy

### **1. Introductions and welcome**

JP welcomed the two new commissioners Alison Barnes and Piers Williamson

### **2. Minutes from the last meeting**

Commissioners to send any comments on the minutes to secretariat

### **3. Background paper on work programme updates**

- Commissioners suggested that the next full commission meeting in March would be an occasion to mark the arrival of the new commissioners who are currently being recruited. This will also give the opportunity for a LSDC photo.

**Action: Secretariat to organise LSDC social and group photo for March 19 meeting**

- Meeting dates for 2010 have been circulated to all commissioners.
- A review of the sub-groups will be carried out once the new Commissioners have been appointed.
- SH, PB and PdZ all indicated they wished to be part of the Economic sub group.

**Action: All to get back to NY on any additional sub group they wish to join.**

- Forward approach:
  - SMcC had indicated to the secretariat that the forward approach and deliver plan was a good idea. However he felt that this approach did change the nature of the commission - it gave it more teeth and would also result in a lot more work.
  - JP suggested a separate session on what a thematic review would entail in the New Year. SH raised the issue of the relationship of the LSDC with the assembly and its committees. Suggested that MT could look at this issue at the next forward approach meeting in the New Year. Also need to speak to

the head of the assembly secretariat on governance and constitutional issues.

#### **4. Mayoral Strategies Workshop session: Responding to the London Plan, Economic Development Strategy and the Mayor's Transport Strategy**

- Presentations: Links to current work programme, LSDC responses to date and feedback from strategy leads meeting – **see attached presentation with these minutes**
- PF presented an update on the LSDC current work programme
- AG presented on the LSDC response to date on the London plan and the discussion held at the Strategy leads meeting
- PdZ presented on the LSDC response to date on the EDS and the discussion held at the Strategy leads meeting
- SH presented on the LSDC response to date on the MTS and the discussion held at the Strategy leads meeting

General Issues raised by commissioners during presentations:

##### **London Plan**

- CC commented that the de-growth agenda is becoming more popular. The de-growth network launch is on the Jan 12<sup>th</sup>
- Commissioners felt it was reasonable to put down markers in the LSDC response that we are doing further work on particular issues e.g. sustainable economic development.
- The question of giving evidence at the examination in public for the LP was raised. LSDC need to be clear what the rules are for this. CC asked whether the LSDC could help co-ordinate a joint response from the community sector (e.g. through Just Space). Could the LSDC hold a workshop for others before the EIP? The commission could also look at the responses received so far. PW asked how the LSDC could communicate the issues so that others take them seriously? **Action: Promotions sub group to look at a possible event/session and communication. NB. Events would need to be in March/April to fit with EIP timetable.**
- Issue of Outer London – Outer London commission stance has changed since the start of the development of the LP.

##### **EDS**

- Would be useful to describe in the LSDC response what the LDA vision would look like in business as usual – could be set out against the LSDC vision as a contrast.
- Low Carbon Capital Growth report is due out in the spring. LSDC questioned why this report is not reflected in the EDS.

- Commissioners felt that there is good work being carried out but it is not being mainstreamed or fully reflected in the EDS.
- EDS needs to make clear who should take the lead on various issues. Needs to be clear about leading and enabling role of LDA.
- Also EDS needs to capture the effect of London on the rest of UK and the world. – London ambassadorial role and its effects nationally and internationally.
- Commissioners felt the LSCD vision should be articulated in the EDS response
- Need to raise the issue of relationship with mayor and boroughs and other leaders such as business.
- Recession means that there is/will be a large shift/reliance on private sector finance for EDS delivery. Should the strategy illustrate good business models and how these can be supported, such as cooperative/partnership models?

### **MTS**

- This strategy is more bottom up
- MTS contains lots of stories in contrast to the other two strategies. And paints a picture of how London could look different.
- What would 2031 look like?
- Commissioners felt that outcomes for the MTS needed to be more upfront. e.g. Carbon and air quality. They felt in addition Environmental justice and air quality need to be included and linked to the LP. Also road traffic accidents and access issues needed to be included as outcomes.
- Gap in delivery of CO2 targets
- Given the strategy's reliance on behaviour change, there is a lack of detail in the document on how this can be achieved.
- Suggestion that virtuous cycles could be used as evidence
- Issue of potential MTS procurement needs to link back to EDS
- Air quality missing

### **Workshop session**

The Commissioners then divided into three groups to discuss each strategy in more detail: Discussions in break out groups focussed on addressing the following questions:

- In light of the strategy leads meeting and previous responses (see below) what issues need to be raised in the response?
- In light of the LSCD work programme and priorities (see Agenda Item 3) what specific issues need to be raised?
- Are there any implications for the other two strategies and others due out shortly (e.g. CC mitigation)

**London Plan:** AG, NY, AB, CC, JP

- Strategy document – as well as stopping things can also make things happen e.g. on site renewables.
- LSCD vision - need to be articulated in the response
- Worries:
  - Outer London Vision could be a lot clearer. There appears to be conflict between boroughs.
  - Relationship between Inner and Outer London
  - Housing
  - No mention of land based economy e.g. urban farming / natural environment/ green belt
  - What is vision for non-built areas? Conversation, flood plains, food growing – this is being undervalued at present in the strategy
  - Need to distinguish metropolitan centres e.g. Croydon. There is a lack of clarity in vision for these. Which are growth areas?
- Is there any vision on narrowing gap in inequalities e.g. opportunity areas – not clear.
- What are these neighbourhoods going to be like? What will London look like by 2031? e.g. decentralised heating, redesigned neighbourhoods.
- What is nice? Many parts of London are far from nice. Need long term plans to address this issue. Where is the vision?
- Natural character of London e.g. Heath lands, marshlands, natural geology. Where regeneration happens this natural character needs to come through. Where is this vision?
- What is the vision for poorer areas of London? What major investments will be put in place to help these areas e.g. lower cost energy.
- Life long neighbourhoods – good words, but no details and vision.
- A strategic document needs to direct boroughs. How far can strategic detail go? Need the vision in the document. What would be there? How would it function? e.g. Alara food growing vision for Kings Cross.
- Need examples of high quality developments – no stories in the document. A link website on good examples would be useful addition to LP.
- Can we rely in the market to realise these vision?
- Low carbon vision – need to be articulated better in the document.
- Lacking vision to say how CO2 targets will be met - MTS does this better. What guidance is there for carbon planners?
- Missing Policies:
  - Air Quality – Links to MTS and implications for land use
  - Low Emission zone
- Food growing – more about building community cohesion than meeting London food needs.

### **Mayor's Transport Strategy:** SH, PF, RS, PB

- Vision – what would London in 2031 look like?
- Reducing the need to travel – transport not an end in itself
- Procurement - needs to be linked to EDS. This is a cross cutting issue. How can procurement of electric cars link to the EDS e.g. stimulating market for electric car parts.
- Needs to link across to planning
- Governance – how would the MTS be implemented? How will MTS get boroughs to implement?
- Outcomes - CO2 and air quality, expands out to behaviour change, traffic accidents
- Behaviour change - across all three strategies. Targets and measurement needs to be developed for this. Discussion over behaviour change e.g. based on evidence at TfL – travel wise 3% reduction. However Bedzed achieved bigger reductions in travel – 30%
- Population predictions - are these correct?
- Air quality – currently a lack of robust evidence
- Electric Vehicles – Does not talk about change in modes
- TfL could talk to people who don't drive - accessibility issues?

### **Economic Development Strategy:** PdZ, BM, MT, PW

The LSDC response should advise that:

- The EDS must set out more coherently where London should aim to get to and how it will fulfil Mayoral objectives especially objectives 2 and 3 as the stated policies themselves appear insufficient.
- It is necessary for the EDS to go beyond the 'green economy' by mainstreaming across all sectors of the economy.
- Innovative work such as the Low Carbon Capital Growth report by Ernst and Young should be highlighted more throughout that EDS and used to show how work is being undertaken to take a wider approach to economic recovery and activity that the EDS itself suggests.
- The retrofitting economy - a step change is underway yet is not clear from the EDS that the effect this will have as an economic driver has been scoped by the LDA or that the LDA envisages a London retrofit standard as being necessary to act as a catalyst. Indeed, the LDA does not seem to spell out what its role could or should be beyond involvement in a handful of pilot projects.

- The EDS should set out and work through what are the implications of London operating as an open economy. For example, as an open economy inward migration has its effects and societal pressures exist as a result.
- The EDS's preference for relying on London's inherent 'baseline' strengths have not been worked through and it is unclear as a result how these will fit with carbon consumption-based reductions. The EDS needs to set out with more evidence and certainty how the economic approach will deliver equity and carbon reduction and the role necessary to be played in this by all sectors.
- Post recession assuming a return to business as usual and reliance on London's core economic strengths there are still likely to be extreme inequalities as a result of the way the economy operates. The EDS does not present any new thinking on what will be done other than the now well established and good to have, though somewhat cyclical and pedestrian, policies and approaches to skills, childcare provision. Having these allows London to keep to a standstill position but they do not break the cycle of inequality in a sustained way.
- The EDS should also set out the barriers to aims and objectives being reached. For example, good policies on childcare and skills have been adopted and put into effect for several years. The lessons from this are becoming clear but the new EDS does not draw out how these will be used to adjust policies and practice.

How the EDS links to and operates with the other key strategies is hard to discern. For example:

- how do the London Plan's growth trajectories fit with the LDA's plans?
- what will outer London look as a result of the EDS approach?
- how will the green economy look and impact across London as a whole?
- how are the presumptions about the role of retailing (and therefore consumption) be reflected spatially in London / in outer London?
- which private sector models for decarbonising and sustainable consumptions are to be adopted as good practice which the LDA itself will champion?
- Proposal 3B links spatial, sectors and skills

### **Plenary: Cross Cutting Issues**

- Behaviour change:
  - can't do this with out low carbon
  - infrastructure
  - leadership
- Inequalities
- Low Carbon and embedded carbon
- Leadership:
  - relationship between the three strategies
  - Which strategy as lead on vision? LP?
  - Single integrated strategy in other regions

- Urgency
- Who will deliver
- Lack of follow through on strategies
- Gaps in Air quality
- Access
- Population growth - what are assumptions and implications
- Overcoming blockages – need to identify these first.
- Whole Economy approach

### **Next steps**

- Secretariat to write up and collate today's discussion – circulate before Christmas
- Commissioners to send any additional comments to secretariat – by 5<sup>th</sup> Jan
- Secretariat to liaise with AG, PdZ and SH to finalise LSDC responses including detailed comments on each strategy and also cross-cutting issues
- Sign off responses at Planning and Development sub group on 12<sup>th</sup> Jan
- Closing date for final responses – 5pm 12<sup>th</sup> Jan!

### **5. AOB**

JP thanked Bryony Mathie who is leaving the GLA at the end of January for all the work that she has done to support the commission and the London Leaders programme.

**Next meeting:** Friday 19<sup>th</sup> March 2010