

## **LONDON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

### **NOTES OF THE 20 MARCH 2006 MEETING**

#### **Present:**

June Barnes (Chair)	East Thames Group
Shaun McCarthy	BAA
Dinah Cox	Race on the Agenda
Robin Stott	Consultant Physician
Penny Shepherd	UK Social Investment Forum
Nigel Bell	Imperial College
Peter Head	Director Arup
Ranjit S Baxi	J & H Sales International
Craig Cordice	One Spare Chair
Mike Tuffrey	GLA Assembly
Sue Riddlestone	BioRegional

#### Observers:

Penny Bramwell	Government Office for London
Lesley Harding	London Development Agency
Gullnar Hasnain	London Development Agency

#### **GLA:**

Shirley Rodrigues	Head of Environment
Emma Synnott	GLA Policy Support Unit
Niall Machin	GLA Policy Support Unit
Simi Awosika	GLA Business Support Unit

#### **Presentations given by:**

Peter Head	Director Arup
Shirley Rodrigues	Head of Environment

**Apologies:** Paul de Zylva, David Fell, Andrew Judge, Simon Woolley, Samantha Heath

#### **1. Introductions and declarations of interest**

JB welcomed Commissioners and announced that Joanne Wade had resigned from the Commission. There were no declarations of interests.

#### **2. Chair's announcement**

JB provided an overview of her priorities for the Commission noting that the Mayor had appointed her for a two year term. JB stated that it was important to be positive about the Commission's successes and the role the Commission had played, and the impact it had had so far. Having talked with Commissioners, and since taking up the Chair, June highlighted several key issues that that she wanted to address:

- The governance of the Commission;
- The way in which the GLA family view the LSDC;
- To try and make a better case for sustainable development;
- The resources available to the LSDC.

June noted that she had spoken individually with nearly all Commissioners since taking up the chairship and the feedback would help frame a questionnaire for Commissioners

as part of the Best Value Review. Some of the feedback to date included that there was a need to:

- Have a clearer understanding of the role of the Commission;
- Look at some sort of code of conduct in view of the fact that the Commission is voluntary;
- Have some process for accountability, specific terms for Commissioners to serve and other governance related issues
- Develop an induction process for new Commissioners.

JB noted that the Best Value Review will be important for addressing some of these issues, but she recognised that generally Commissioners felt that the LSDC is not being taken sufficiently seriously by elements of the GLA family and this was something to be addressed separately. This most concerns the LDA in terms of its approach to sustainability. Although TfL as well. June indicated her desire that the LSDC set some challenges for the GLA family, calling for a more radical agenda that is not incremental but sets a new agenda for sustainability.

JB indicated that there was a need for to make a better case for sustainable development to key decision-makers so that it was embraced as a fundamental and necessary platform for London. A key to making a better case would be developing the virtuous cycles work as a potentially very powerful way to articulate the multiple benefits of sustainable development to decision makers.

June also suggested that there was a need to better make the case for sustainable development to ordinary Londoners and that one way to do this would be through a popular campaign. The support of the Mayor could be sought for such a campaign.

The resources available to the LSDC are not sufficient if the LSDC is to adequately perform its role. As the LSDC is voluntary, it needs to rely on officer support and this support needs bolstering. JB will make this case making reference to the NSDC Next Steps recommendations which argued that SD roundtables needed to be better resources.

JB noted that she is to meeting with Jonathon Porritt, the Mayor, Nicky Gavron and Murziline Parchment over the next few weeks to discuss these issues.

There was general agreement with the core of June's argument to make a stronger case for sustainability in London and that better mobilisation of resources to support a more radical agenda was necessary. Specific comments were:

- LSDC needed to consider how it related to London stakeholders as well as the GLA group;
- The agenda of the LSDC needed to be strategic and not project driven;
- The LSDC has a radical platform in the Framework but we need the tools to articulate it more clearly;
- In undertaking any popular campaign, the LSDC needed to ask whether it is the right body to do so given that it is just one of many SD related bodies in London;
- Need to include TfL into the areas of concern within the GLA Group in terms of being appropriately linked to the LSDC.

It was agreed that the question of what a more radical agenda for a sustainable London might look like would be developed at the Away-Day.

GH and LH indicated that the LDA would be open to looking at the virtuous cycle approach as part of its work on sustainable development.

**Action:**

JB to make her opening statement available for Commissioners in advance of the away-day.

JB to provide feedback to Commissioners on the outcomes of discussions.

**3. Commission successes**

The Commission's influences and successes were discussed. It was noted that PDZ had sent comments in absentia on the paper suggesting that it be amended to include work on Local Area Agreements, the Economic Development Strategy, and that it made more of the Commission's role in relation to the Olympics.

It was agreed that the Commission had largely contributed to the successful Olympic bid through advocating for an integrated concept of sustainability and in identifying joined up mechanisms for delivering the Olympics such as requiring planning applications to identify prospective jobs and resources demands.

PB requested that the paper highlight that the Commission had been successful in working with players like GoL and DEFRA in particularly on the LAA work.

**Action:**

NM to revise paper to reflect amendments.

**4. Energy and climate change policy - feedback and follow-up.**

SRO briefed Commission on some progress of Energy and climate change policy since the last meeting. She noted that the response to the national energy review was a big focus at present, but that other priorities were:

- London Plan Review – looking at how to make new buildings more energy efficient and in line with climate change adaptation
- Retrofitting of existing buildings
- Code for Sustainable Homes – developing the GLA response
- Discussions on what policies the Climate Change Partnership should be promoting.

SRO highlighted the opportunity to look at how the LSDC and the Energy and Climate Change partnerships could work more closely together.

SRO explained that the National Energy Review was looking for evidence-based views on options for meeting future energy needs. It was noted that there were three key elements to the GLA's proposed response:

- A report jointly commissioned with Greenpeace which identified energy options that could act as an alternative to a nuclear future – the report finds that distributed energy solutions are the best option;
- Promoting the role of energy efficiency in reducing total consumption;
- Promoting cleaner vehicles and modal shift.

Key issues and comments raised by the Commission were:

- Linking energy efficiency into the work of the Climate Change Agency;

- Making the links between social benefits/enterprise and community energy options – eg using revenue savings/income from community energy projects to fund other community activities;
- Following through on the chain of Renewable Energy Obligation Certificates (ROCs) from the Climate Change Agency in terms of whether they are ‘retired’ or kept by the agency and how this will impact on carbon accounting for London;
- Ensuring that the GLA response, although evidence based, does not ignore creative or innovative thinking about how energy solutions can be delivered.

Specific examples and contacts which might be of use in finalising the submission were:

- The community partnership initiative in Newham (JB).
- Chinese Sustainable City Project, which relies social community involvement (PH).
- Amery Lowins speech to the Institute of Civil Engineering
- The work of the Tyndall Centre to involve communities in carbon reduction programmes;
- The work of the School of Social Enterprise in supporting social enterprise.

SRO agreed that it would be useful to feed community initiatives into the response, but noted that the emphasis should be on evidence-based proposals.

The Commission agreed to consider the option of supporting the GLA’s submission to the National Energy Review through a covering letter, or inclusion in the report.

**Action:**

- SRO to find out more information on ROCS in response to SM’s question and report back to Commission at the next meeting.
- ES to circulate the draft report to the Commission.
- Executive Group to consider how best to show Commission support for the GLA submission.

**5. Best Value Review – LSDC governance issues**

NM gave background on the best value review paper and noted that consultants had been appointed. NM noted that there was also an efficiency review of partnerships (including the LSDC) which will be undertaken, but that this would be a separate process to the Best Value Review.

Commissioners suggested that:

- The consultants speak to Local Authorities, Association of London Government and key London stakeholders for a wider perspective.
- The review not only to reflect stakeholders views of the Commission, but also the role and work of individual Commissioners.

**6. Subgroup updates**

*GLA Group*

RS noted that the group had tried to address how the commission could influence the GLA family in the broadest sense, but through specific projects including the development of SD KPIs for the GLA Group. Work on KPIs was progressing well and a further update would be provided at next meeting. In addition, the sub-group agreed

to propose that the full Commission support using part of the away-day to finalise the key messages to be put into the SD commentary report. (Dealt with under away-day)

#### *Promotion sub group*

CC noted that the sub-group had focussed on the ways in which the Commission's profile could be raised, particularly through the web. He indicated that separate branding for the LSDC website would be best achieved through more independent website, which could have links to other sustainable community networks. ES noted that GLA policy made it difficult for groups or Commissions to have independent websites, but acknowledged that this was an issue which needed to be resolved.

PB noted that the sub-group had also been active in the area of LAAs and that the third round of LAAs was due to be announced.

There was general agreement that the promotions agenda needed to prioritise key messages the Commission wanted to promote and to whom before it focussed on the medium and method. It was acknowledged that the scale of the promotions works meant that the effort of the group was likely to be spread too thinly. It was noted that this would be a key area for discussion for away-day.

#### *Olympic subgroup*

SM said that the Olympic Sub group was meeting Olympic Development Agency (ODA) and LOCOG monthly. He outlined the proposed aims of subgroup and noted that the challenges for the sub-group at the moment related to the operational and conceptual establishment of the group within the broad Olympic 'map'. SMC indicated that work is progressing to finalise arrangements for the sub-group with the aim of agreeing a specific role and remit in May.

PB noted that many Commissioners were sitting on various groups and that it was important to make sure that work was not overlapping in relation to the Olympics. PH announced that he was sitting on the Olympic Construction Taskforce, dealing with sustainability issues. ARUP has also been appointed as part of the consortium to undertake the masterplan for the Olympic Park.

#### *Planning and development sub group*

PH noted that in relation to the London Plan Review the sub group had made a strong case for sustainable appraisal methodology based on the framework and virtuous cycles. PH noted that it was difficult to carry out the work with such a small group of regular attendees. JB suggested that there should be a review on Commissioners assigned to sub groups following the Awayday.

#### *Executive sub group*

JB updated the Commission on progress in relation to the Gaps and Opportunities project which is looking at the gaps and opportunities in implementing the UK Sustainable Development Strategy in London. She noted that the draft report will be circulated in the near future.

## **7. Away day draft agenda**

JB outlined the rationale for the away-day (proposed date 11<sup>th</sup> of May), noting that it should bring together the key issues that Commissioners individually have raised and that the Commission has collectively highlighted.

Key themes for the away day include:

- Revisiting the role of the LSDC in terms of its strategic and critical interventions;
- How to set a more challenging agenda for London
- How to use Virtual Cycles and how the Commission measures its success

It was generally agreed that the away-day would be beneficial, and it was suggested that to enhance its benefits, the following could be pursued:

- Engaging a facilitator;
- Sending out examples of virtuous cycles in advance, and asking individual Commissioners to consider what evidence can be linked to demonstrate their success.

It was agreed that

- › RS and PH will provide for circulation to other Commissioners a spectrum of cycles, which have already been put together.
- › An enabling Chair will facilitate event
- › Commissioners will be asked to lead in certain areas
- › terms of reference and other relevant papers will be circulated

**Action:**

ES and NM to finalise arrangements in conjunction with JB and the Executive Group.

**8. Minutes of the last meeting held on 13 December 2005**

It was noted that CC and SRI gave their apologies. The minutes were agreed as amended.

Outstanding actions

It was noted that Item 2 – Commission and governance is outstanding. JB proposed that it be dealt with as part of the governance review.

Letter – Draft London Food Strategy

PB noted letter had not reflected that she sits on the London Food Board. ES to note.

**Any other business**

JB noted that she intended to write to Commissioners who were not attending to seek their ongoing commitment or to other nominations from their organisations.

**Action:**

JB to write to Commissioners who do not attend meetings regularly asking if they are still committed to attend or perhaps suggest other people from their organisations.

**Next Commission meeting: 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2006**