

Lee Forum Neighbourhood Forum Minutes
17th October 2017
3 Micheldever Rd, Lee, London

Attendees

Sarah McMicheal, Gill Stoker, Nicolette Duckham, Pat and Peter Richardson, Howell Thomas, Micheal Diamond, Marcus Mayers

Previous Meeting Minutes

Noted that Linda Wanbon and Nicolette Duckham are missing from previous meetings and should be added for accuracy

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved

Review of Draft Neighbourhood Plan Polices and Projects

Transport

Cross boundary transport and conservation work streams have been started. All actions complete from last meeting complete

It was agreed that on street parking should be discouraged for new developments. However to ensure people living in these developments are not isolated the policies around bike storage, bike sharing, and car clubs never being 500m away in the area are required. This will ensure transport poverty would not be an issue for new residents.

Bus shelters need mentioning in the policy.

MD to re-issue transport projects and policies for review by the working group. **MD**

Heritage and Character

It was agreed that further work was required on polices need more work to ensure a cohesive approach to preventing out of character properties being developed. **ND & SM** to discuss how to make progress in this area with the sub group.

Conservation and listing is close to being ready for submission. Four potential conservation areas: Lee High Rd, Lee Green crossroads, Manor Park, Cambridge Drive,

It was noted that a policy around refuse and bin storage required covering residential and commercial properties.

It was agreed that murals in appropriate locations can be supported if not damaging to exposed heritage brick work. A policy on this topic to be added?

ND to look at how the policy issue can be resolved. If not a quote to be requested from KP.

Projects

It was noted that a Section 215 briefing document being produced at the request of a local councillor, some enforcement action may occur start shortly following the appropriate process. Greenwich want listings to be received before local listings and Lewisham want them received together. It was agreed that the heritage group are reviewing and agreeing when documents are ready to submit. Committee to be kept informed.

ND reported back that the Local listings work continues and should be ready for submission within a few months. The committee noted and thanked ND for the hard work and effort she has put in to date. The working group are reviewing and feeding back on the submission as it developed. It was agreed that approval of the sub-group would be sufficient for submission to occur, without full review by the committee. However those on the committee who expressed an interest should be kept informed and have the ability to input into the process.

Commercial Properties

A policy for prioritising pedestrians in commercial areas without restricting the passing trade for the Hither Green area and other areas should be considered.

A policy around external CCTV both private and state sponsored could be considered for commercial areas.

Projects

It was agreed that the south London card organisers would be approached about interest in a trader's forum. It was agreed that whilst the Lee Forum would welcome a trader's association such an organisation needed to be built organically by traders and be in a position where it had the ability to improve trader's situation. The committee agreed to keep encouraging and supporting efforts in this area but not take a lead in delivering such an organisation.

Family and Community

The committee discussed a perceived (but not yet quantified) need for affordable nursery and creche spaces. The committee agreed that it was not the role of the plan to mandate the delivery of services, but it could and should propose that it would welcome the creation or conversion of buildings that support the delivery of affordable childcare, as the price of accommodation appears to be a significant element of the cost of supplying child services.

It was agreed that the policy should encourage the creation of shared working/meeting space. It was felt that such space may encourage less commuting which would have multiple benefits including, less congestion and pollution, increased retention of money locally, higher quality of life. This could be based on the mayor of London policy maybe applicable. **Working group to check and consider**

With regards to school provision it was agreed that the evidence presented was inconclusive in supporting or rejecting the call for more school places in the area. It was also noted that this was a complex issue that a number of other bodies and consultations would examine, all of which are better resourced to tackle the issue. It was also noted that school place requirement is an incredibly dynamic requirement that would not be well managed with the confines of a neighbourhood plan. As a result the Forum agreed that it will not have an opinion or direct stance for or against new schools in the area.

The committee agreed that whilst the requirement is dynamic it should ensure that sites suitable for D1 conversion, use or protection should be considered.

The committee also discussed to proposed free school site and in line with the above deliberation agreed that it was not in a position to conclude how the land should, or shouldn't be used. However

the committee unanimously agreed that the designation as metropolitan land should be protected. It was agreed that the land should be designated as only being available for community use.

Green Spaces

It was agreed that PR would look into funding opportunities to pursue some Green Spaces projects

General

It was noted that the Forum was being asked to support/object to various schemes in the local area including school, Leegate and Mayfields hostel. The committee noted the importance of these issues to the nature of the area and the community. The committee then discussed how it should intervene in these situations. It was agreed that the role of the committee is to ensure that clear and specific guidance is given through the neighbourhood plan as to what is or isn't permissible within the area.

Given the neighbourhood plan is a consultative document that will be voted on by the whole community, its approval will give it all the remit it requires to guide such complex and delicate decisions. It was also noted that until the neighbourhood plan is adopted any intervention is likely to be based on the personal opinions of the committee rather than the collective acceptance of the community the plan will represent.

As a result, the committee agreed that it will remain neutral in these dialogues. It will be available to engage in these processes by:

1. Giving (anonymised) access to consultation data to interested parties which they may use when responding to applications
2. Advising interested parties of the direction of travel of the neighbourhood plan which again can be used when responding to applications.
3. Increasing awareness of planning applications and encouraging interested parties to make their own responses.
4. The forum could respond to specific applications by submitting a summary of data gathered through consultation that is relevant to an application.