#### **Attendees**

Cllr Kevin Bonavia (KB) Blackheath Ward Member (LBL) (Chair)

Cllr Amanda de Ryk (AdR)

Cllr Paul Morrissey (PM)

Blackheath Ward Member (LBL)

Blackheath and Westcombe Ward

Member (RBG)

Martin Hyde (MH) LBL Stephen Roedel (SR) RBG

Shirley Broughton (SB) Westcombe Society

Anna Townend (AT)
Tony Butler (TB)

Philip Craig (PC) Greenwich Society

Margaret Dinkeldein (MD)

Mike Norton (MN) Westcombe Society

Steve Ragdale (SR) RBG

Helen Reeves (HR) Blackheath Society

Alan Rice (AR) Governor All Saints Primary School

Laura Gregory (LG) LBL (Minutes)

#### 1. Apologies And Introductions

Apologies were received from Cllr Matthew Pennycook, Cllr Gareth Siddorn, Cllr Aidan Smith and David Walker.

Laura Gregory (LBL) was introduced as the minute taker for the evening.

### 2. Minutes Of Last Meetings (20th of November 2014)

#### i Accuracy

The minutes from the BJWP meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> of November 2014 were agreed as an accurate reflection of the discussion.

ii Matters Arising

No matters were raised.

### 3. Proposal for the Expansion of All Saints Primary School

Alan Rice, a Governor at All Saints Primary School, was introduced to the BJWP. AR explained that All Saints Primary School has been asked to take a 'bulge' class and in order to accommodate the additional pupils some extension work to the school is required.

Surveys of the site have been conducted to identify where additional space could be added with minimal disruption. The area identified for potential works is the back of the school site as this would allow for the development of some additional classrooms, a new kitchen, hall and some admin facilities.

AR explained that the timeline for the proposed improvements is as follows:

- End of February 2015: Planning Approval (subject to consultation)
- July 2015- Dec 2015: Phase 1 this covers the kitchen, hall and admin block.
- Dec 2015- Summer 2016: Phase 2 this covers new classrooms

AR outlined that work is underway to investigate access to the back of the school for the work. This would require access via the Heath (as per the approach taken in a previous extension).

Open days are being held at the school for interested parties to attend and ask questions. The details of the sessions are:

- 29<sup>th</sup> of January 9.30-10.00 am (the appointed architects and LBL lead Margaret Brightman are due to attend this session).
- 30<sup>th</sup> of January the session will take place in the morning (exact timings TBC).

KB thanked AR for the details and queried if the proposals would have any significant impact on the heath. AR explained that aside from the temporary access required to bring materials to the site (via Goffers Rd) and sight of some roof scape from the heath no other impacts are envisaged.

KB agreed that providing the construction period is managed well, with any small restorations undertaken as required, there seemed to be no issues with the proposal. AdR outlined her expectation that the site would be subject to a Construction Management Plan that would need to be approved by Planners and welcomed this much needed capital investment in the schools infrastructure.

AR offered to attend Blackheath Society and Greenwich Society meetings to brief those groups separately if desirable.

### 4. Blackheath (SMINC) Nature Conservation Group

SB introduced the list of projects that the Nature Conservation Group have identified and passed papers to the group.

HR and KB suggested it would be useful to prioritise the list submitted by the conservation group. KB explained that he was keen to pick this suggestion up in item 6 of the agenda.

### 5. Feedback from the meeting with Kevin Sheehan (OnBlackheath/Good Hope Festival)

KB explained that on the 7<sup>th</sup> of January he met with Kevin Sheehan (Exec Director for Customer Services, LBL) and MH, MN, PC and John Thompson from LBL also attended. The Blackheath society also had a pre-arranged meeting with Kevin Sheehan the following day.

PC explained that the meeting with Kevin had been useful and provided an opportunity to raise some the concerns the BJWP had with the OnBlackheath event. The specific points raised include:

**Noise Levels**- KS explained that as other events such as those held in Clapham and Victoria Park have higher noise limits that the 70DB limit (bass 80DB), and as there were a limited number of complaints about noise, there was no compelling reason to reduce the noise level for the event this year.

**Capacity**- PC queried why ONBH have been granted additional crowd capacity for the event this year (increasing from 15,000 to 25,000) and suggested that an increase to 20,000 would be a better compromise. KS explained that as ONBH had proved from their 2014 event that they could manage an event with large attendance the council we satisfied with their ability to manage increased numbers.

**BJWP input**: KS expressed and keenness to engage with the BJWP on future ONBH events and stressed that ONBH are required to engage with the BJWP in advance of their event.

MH explained that although the events are annual, they will be reviewed year by year and any concerns that arise after each event will be taken into account in the planning and regulations for the future events. KB agreed, and suggested this is evidenced by the fact that some of the equipment for the ONBH event will be sited at a different location for the 2015 event – this is a direct result of feedback following the 2014 event.

HR explained that many of the same issues outlined above were discussed during the meeting the BHSOC had with KS. A further point raised was linked to travel interference caused by the events and the need to ensure the organisations hosting the events cover the associated costs of re-routing buses etc.

SB warned that the impact of the events on the acid grass would also need to be monitored closely. Even if the citing of the event is off where the acid grass is understood to be, there is a risk that the map of the health showing areas of acid grass is out of date.

### 6. Improvements to the Heath (from available funding)

KB explained that, as a result of the ONBH event, £15k worth of funding is available to be spent on projects that will bring improvements to the heath. There are a number of projects that have already enquired about funding, but KB emphasised that the process for allocating the funds needs to be fair and transparent. The process was proposed:

 Written and costed proposals must be submitted to the secretary of the BJWP by email to <u>rosalind.jeffrey@lewisham.gov.uk</u> by 5pm on Thursday, 5 February 2015.

- The BJWP will then prepare a shortlist of proposals to ensure that a range of ecological, infrastructure and leisure projects are taken through to the final round.
- Those shortlisted to the final round will be invited to present their proposals for a public vote at the BJWP annual public meeting on Thursday 19 February 2015 at 7.30pm, The Bake House Age Exchange.
- Whilst the meeting on 19 February will be a public meeting and all attendees will be able to comment or ask questions of any of the shortlisted proposals, the vote itself will be limited to individuals resident in the London Borough of Lewisham as the funds are held on behalf of the London Borough of Lewisham. An "honesty" approach will apply.

Local residents and organisations with an interest in the Borough of Lewisham (for the avoidance of doubt this includes organisations containing individuals resident outside the borough) are invited to submit bids to be considered for this funding. It was agreed that those interested in applying should note the following points:

- Proposals must be focused on improvements to or on the Lewisham side of the Heath (ie south of Shooters Hill Road)
- The BJWP welcomes smaller scale applications (e.g. of no more than £5,000 each) as this will allow a selection of projects to be funded. However, if you feel you have a knock-out proposal that would require the full £15,000 these would be considered.
- Proposals that include match-funding are encouraged
- Single applications submitted by a group of organisations are welcomed.

PM suggested that it would be useful to run proposals past the councils Ecology Officer and also the European Projects officer to identify if match funding or even larger scale investment may be available.

#### 7. Planning The Annual Public Meeting

HR asked how the public meeting would be publicised, KB explained that it is primarily done via assembly meetings and also the local amenity society meetings.

KB proposed that the agenda for the public meeting should therefore be:

- 1. What's happening in 2015 on the heath (covering both boroughs), this should also cover the changes to the events policy
- 2. The funding allocation.

### 8. Review Of Draft Events Policy

KB explained that in 2011 both Lewisham and Greenwich boroughs jointly developed draft events policies, however the Lewisham policy was the only one ratified. The five year policy is due for review in 2016, it covers the whole of Lewisham borough with a specific appendix for Blackheath.

MH passed round a paper detailing the proposed amendments to the policy that are of particular relevance to Blackheath.

The full policy will be reviewed for 2016 which will involve extensive consultation and a BJWP meeting ought to be dedicated to that topic closer to the time.

PC asked about the protocol for holding events on the heath as there's been a general concern that the in allowing the events to happen the local authority has ended up subsidising private enterprise. MH agreed that a protocol with clearly defined tariffs relating to duration and capacity of events needed to be developed for the new policy. MH explained that as the large scale events on the heath become more mature the local authority will look to be more sophisticated at ensuring its costs are covered and that there is some funding made available to local community groups as a result of such events being hosted in the area.

The BJWP agreed that they supported the proposed amendments to the 2011-16 policy but wanted to stress that a policy that's better coordinated across the two boroughs should be the ambition for the new policy.

#### 9. AOB

No points were raised.