Foreword

In Lambeth we have over 60 parks and open spaces. They enrich our lives and make Lambeth a better place to live, visit, and work. From major and local events and casual and competitive sports, to outdoor play spaces for children, we can see that parks are necessities in modern cities.

Our parks and open spaces have been experiencing a renaissance in recent years. We have seen our many active parks groups rise to become champions of our green spaces, exploring new models of devolved park management; we have 11 Green Flag Award winning parks, the highest number we’ve ever had; and the latest Residents Survey revealed that 76% of local people judged our parks and open spaces to be good or excellent.

And now, for the first time, we have a Parks Capital Investment Plan that puts a framework in place to help everyone see what the priorities are for improving all our parks and open spaces. It also provides the evidence and rationale for investing in parks and underpins the thinking behind future improvement schemes.

This plan represents the biggest investment we have ever made in our parks and open spaces. Our friends of parks and communities have shown us time and again the value of our parks, and this plan as a demonstration of our commitment, is in response to your efforts.

Yet while we have a vital role in delivering this plan, we cannot do it alone. This is a story of partnerships where the Council and local people work together to help shape and deliver these schemes. We can see the powerful impact our communities and local residents have had on the planning and design of improvements across our parks and open spaces and in the wake of the governments austerity programme, we are now calling on you to take an even greater role.

We know this is an enormous ask. To demonstrate our commitment, we will wrap support around you; use some of our initial investment towards creating targeted project delivery support capacity. All we need now is your help.

This plan shows us what really matters to the many people that use our parks and open spaces. Working together, we hope this plan will be the catalyst for stronger coordination to enhance the future of Lambeth’s parks.

Thank you for joining our efforts to protect and improve our valuable green spaces and parks.

Cllr Jane Edbrooke
Cabinet Member, Neighbourhood
Introduction

Lambeth has the largest geographic area of any inner London borough, and 303,000 ethnically diverse people live here. Largely residential, it is one of the most densely populated places in the country, with more than twice the London population density and a projected increase of over 15% by 2030. Although we are fortunate to benefit from a wealth of open spaces of different types, ranging from parks, gardens, green corridors, nature reserves, and playing fields, we also know that this growing population needs to be served by sufficient quantity and high quality open spaces.

Our parks and open spaces are an integral part of daily life. From taking a walk in your local park with the benefits of fresh air, to playing sports in one of the facilities in the park, engaging in a family trip to the playground, or a picnic with old friends – our parks offer something for everyone. They have provided a cost effective means of promoting health and well-being; created a mechanism for increasing community and resident involvement in volunteering and service delivery; provided an excellent social return on investment. All of which, make Lambeth a more attractive place to visit, live, and work.

During times of economic hardship and in light of reductions to public sector funding, funds available to spend on cultural services such as parks are less. Against that backdrop, we know that we cannot continue funding our services in the same way. For example, rather than spend funds on creating new spaces, we could unlock new public spaces through existing estate regeneration plans, freeing up funds for alternative use. This is part of our renewed focus on value for money, innovation, and supporting new ways of working, which is where Lambeth’s Cooperative Parks model steps in.

The Cooperative Parks Programme seeks to empower local communities to take on greater decision-making and management responsibilities for their local park or open space in line with three core levels of management. In some cases, local groups will adopt a level three model and pursue independent management of their park or open space. For other green spaces, a level two joint management arrangement that brings together Lambeth and local people in a single decision-making body is preferred. And then again, some are happy to continue with Council management. Regardless of the cooperative parks model adopted, we hope to create an environment where our parks services are more accountable to the people who use them.

Supporting new management arrangements is a challenge. We know there is more to this than meets the eye. To ensure the development of successful independent management models, we need to open up new funding streams. We need to invest our resources wisely; towards schemes that will bring more money back into the park to help sustain everyday operations and fund future capital improvements. We need to ensure our communities seeking joint management play an active role in designing the park improvements and helping us raise money for schemes. We need to remember the needs of the parks that remain under Council management and make sure their capital improvements are met. Evidence-based planning is crucial to achieving all these goals.
This five year Parks Capital Investment Plan is the first time we have attempted to evidence and prioritise investment across all Lambeth’s parks and open spaces. We have set out the criteria we used to prioritise the schemes. We spoke with our local communities to ensure we understood what is needed to support their cooperative and community-led management ambitions. And we now plan to invest £9million; the largest capital investment we’ve ever made across our parks and open spaces to help meet your aspirations.

But we can not do this alone. Nearly £20million is needed to deliver this plan in full, of which roughly £2million has already been secured through S106 and other funding avenues. This leaves us with an outstanding amount of £18million. Using our £9million investment, we will fund a range of improvement projects across the borough that have been assessed as highest priority. For the rest, we will need your help.

We know this is no small feat. In recognition of this fact, we will drive a portion of our initial £9million investment towards supporting local communities meet this challenge. Specifically, we will provide additional capacity in the form of dedicated project delivery support officers whose remit will be to work with groups to raise or apply for external funding; to jointly explore new avenues for funding, which may range from partnership applications to National Governing Bodies of Sport or charitable foundations, to smaller fundraising events or activities.

Even so, delivering this plan will rely on us working together to step up to the challenge. There is already a history of Lambeth’s communities actively participating in seeking funding and we hope this plan and its vision inspires you to do more to help us provide the best parks experience for those who live, visit, and work in Lambeth.

We hope you can see that meeting our collective ambitions for parks can only take place with your help.
Capital Plan Overview

The development of this Parks and Open Spaces Capital Plan stemmed from the need to tackle some of the issues that have been raised in the past, including:

- lack of transparency and evidence-based decision-making
- inconsistent investment across the borough and across individual parks and spaces
- limited community involvement in decision-making process
- competing demands and priorities for investment – including grant applications
- overlapping and complex investment plans (e.g. Master Plans, Management Plans, Green Flag Award Plans)

Drafting a Capital Investment Plan to span all our parks and open spaces has never been done before. Trying to capture the significant number of parks, their individual characteristics, and the changing face of local people and user groups takes a concerted effort. However, we accepted the challenge and as a result, have produced for the first time a clear and transparent programme of investment for the next five years.

And we haven’t stopped there. As part of our renewed commitment to parks and open spaces, we have taken this one step further. Through this plan we have committed to funding £9million of capital improvement works, which will deliver at a minimum, three schemes in each neighbourhood area that have been prioritised for immediate investment listed. It will also be used to match fund external contributions to help deliver the plan’s remaining priorities; all of which are considered essential to improving our green spaces offer.

We know our financial contribution is not enough to deliver all the improvements needed and as such, only forms only part of the picture. Delivering this plan in its entirety will cost close to £20million. As stated, we have committed to funding £9million of improvements. On top of this, we have secured £2million of developer contributions which are matched to projects in this plan. This leaves us with a funding gap of £9million. Our communities have always taken very active roles in raising money to support park activities or events and helping to find match funding for capital projects. We hope to build on this foundation and ask you to work with us to meet this gap. To be our delivery partners across our parks and open spaces.

We know this is a challenge. To support our ambition, we will set aside a portion of our £9million investment to appoint two project delivery support officers to work with local communities on securing external capital funding. This plan will be the future framework we all sign up to and use to coordinate involvement to help us deliver a host of capital improvements across our parks and open spaces. In time, these improvements may even open up new funding streams that support joint or independent management structures and fund everyday operations in parks; an increasing priority in light of the current public sector budget constraints.
Process of Development

This Capital Plan seeks to put in place an evidence-based system for investing in our parks and open spaces over the next five years. It assesses each park’s improvement needs and is framed around the following five neighbourhood areas:

- North Lambeth
- Brixton
- Clapham
- Streatham
- Norwood

Although individual projects are listed in this Plan for each green space, three specific projects have been pulled out as priorities for immediate delivery in each neighbourhood. This is based on the alignment to the prioritisation criteria listed in this plan and available evidence, ranging from consultation feedback to an extensive review of individual parks plans.

Importantly, these projects are not intended to replace individual park masterplans, which provide detailed information on park improvements. Instead, this Plan should be viewed as a broad, all-encompassing Plan that proposes areas for improvement and which recommend guiding principles for future developments. Where available, the detail behind the schemes should be provided by individual park masterplans and should be informed by discussions with local communities. Engaging with residents on the scope, layout, and design of capital improvements will be a key feature of any project being delivered and we expect our pioneering groups that are seeking joint or independent management to play an important role in this process.

To help us put this roadmap in place, we applied the following process:

1. **Cooperative Parks Consultation**
   - Over 1,400 responses were received
   - Locally identified schemes
   - Captured the capital improvement priorities across our green spaces

2. **Platform of Evidence**
   - Review of available information, including park master plans, management plans, and the open space strategy as well as demographic information such as the State of the Borough report
   - Cross reference with findings from Lambeth’s emerging playing pitch strategy
   - Expand list of capital improvement projects

3. **Build Framework**
   - Prioritisation criteria were developed and tested
   - Projects were assessed against criteria
   - Three projects for each neighbourhood were prioritised for immediate delivery

4. **Draft Capital Plan**
   - Draft plan was prepared
   - Draft plan underwent a round of public consultation to test priorities

5. **Final Capital Plan**
   - Feedback from consultation was collated and built into this final version of the plan
This process of prioritisation has enabled us to not only draw on the vision established for our parks, locally tested through the cooperative parks consultation, but build in a means to address areas of historic underinvestment. We also took into account the growing importance of public open space, particularly in light of the future increase in residential density, different park management model requirements, and the Council’s overall budget position.

**Implementation**

The significant reduction in public expenditure has cast a new light on how we fund and deliver improvements to our green spaces. This is an era where we focus on partnerships and driving investment towards projects that will open up new funding streams for parks. Where we all need to take responsibility for raising funding to contribute towards delivering the remaining capital improvement schemes in this plan.

We are supporting this community-driven activity in a number of ways. Firstly, through the appointment of two project delivery support officers whose sole remit will be to work with you to secure external funding to implement this plan; whether it be help in preparing grant applications or support in organising local fundraising events. And secondly, through our ongoing commitment to use this plan as the infrastructural framework for allocating all future funding received for green spaces.

In the past, section 106 (s106) agreements\(^1\) have been a key vehicle for funding improvements in parks (e.g. building a new playground or basketball court) given its purpose to mitigate the impact of new developments. These S106 allocations have also been used to supplement major funding applications to help deliver park regeneration schemes.

From this point on, all S106 open space contributions will be matched to appropriate projects in this plan, as it is paid in to the council. In some cases, this may instigate possible grant applications as it can act as the match funding contribution. There will also be further funding opportunities that exist with the advent of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the emerging local area cooperative growth plans, which will integrated in a few years time in line with the steady increase in CIL receipts.

The road ahead is a difficult one. We hope that you will join us and with our pooled resources, help us deliver the much needed, modernised park infrastructure that better meets the evolving needs

---

\(^1\) A funding stream that is tied to new developments to mitigate the impact of the growth in population as a result of the development. Funds are currently allocated by the Council, in consultation with local communities and councillors.

---

**How do my cooperative parks plans fit in?**

There is a lot going on in our parks and open spaces, from sports and events through to the newly developed cooperative parks programme. This is all part of our transformation of the parks service and as this plan highlights, we have high hopes for delivering major capital improvements as well. However for many projects in this plan, we need your help.

**Level 3**: Independent pioneers will be better positioned to finance or secure funding for improvements as community-led enterprises, and will define what is delivered.

**Level 2**: Cooperative pioneers will, together with other partners, including members and the Council, agree what funding is used for what projects in this plan.

**Level 1**: Improvement projects in parks and open spaces managed by the Council will be delivered as funds become available.
of our local area neighbourhoods.

**Prioritisation Criteria**

Attempting to filter the many projects that could improve a park or open space requires a fair and reasonable system. On this basis, we developed a set of criteria that reflect the conversations we’ve had with local residents and groups, including local demand for facilities, previous underinvestment, income generation potential, and value for money. These criteria were applied to the list of projects sourced from the consultation and evidence based review.

Finally, we have also thought about the cooperative parks programme and what is needed to support groups pursuing alternative forms of park management. Where possible, we have described the impact and what is expected under each level of management, from:

- Level 1: council-led management
- Level 2: cooperative (joint) management
- Level 3: community-led (independent) management

Detail on the criteria applied and what it means for the cooperative parks programme is provided below in no particular order.

1. **Addresses issues related to health and safety**
   Part of providing an effective parks service is about taking action to repair facilities or structures before they become unusable, or so dangerous that emergency financing measures are required. This category aims to capture those urgent works that need to take place as they may pose a threat to the health and safety of communities.

2. **Supports sustainable management structures**
   Different projects can open up new sources of money and start to bring regular income into a park (e.g. construction of a café or sports facility). Bearing in mind the cooperative service delivery model and the overall declining public sector purse, we have prioritised projects that generate income for the park. Schemes that will reduce or avoid the ongoing maintenance costs of facilities are also captured here given the impact on budgets.

3. **Contributes to delivering our public health outcomes**
   There are mixed health outcomes for Lambeth residents. Like other inner London boroughs the life expectancy and health of people in Lambeth is generally poorer than the England average. Mental health conditions, especially depressive and anxiety conditions are also highly prevalent.

   There has been a significant amount of research, both in the UK and overseas, demonstrating the positive (and cost-effective) impact of parks on health and wellbeing outcomes. As inclusive environments, parks provide one of the few opportunities for whole-family activities. This criterion assesses the contribution individual capital projects can make to promoting healthy lifestyles and enhancing health.

4. **Enhances reputation of borough**
There are projects that promote Lambeth as a safe, clean, and green borough and ensure it is an exceptional place to live, work, and visit. For example, this could be achieved by providing high-quality facilities in parks that contribute to the sustainability agenda, ranging from the provision of recycling facilities to energy and water conservation measures within park buildings or dedicated on-site composting areas. Or perhaps even an increase in plants or trees given their role in improving air quality and offsetting carbon emissions. Capital schemes that have a positive impact on the borough are considered under this category.

5. Located in areas of deprivation
Areas experiencing multiple deprivation were a key consideration in this plan, in recognition that the outcomes for people living in these areas are often worse than those for people living in less deprived areas. In fact, those living in more deprived communities, who tend to have poorer health and suffer from the kind of illnesses that can be alleviated by regular exposure to green spaces, are also less likely to have good access to high quality parks and green spaces.

The location and surrounding demographics of proposed projects were factored in to the assessment process.

6. Addresses historic lack of investment
As part of the Cooperative Parks consultation, an assessment of capital improvement schemes across all the parks and open spaces over the past five years was carried out. This appraisal highlighted the significant difference in investment across different parks. To a certain extent, much of this is due to s106 investment and its restrictions around proximity to the development. However, by including this criterion in this plan, we are making a case for redressing some of this underinvestment.

7. Represents value for money
Evidence demonstrating the value of parks and open spaces is starting to be quantified, which has played an important part in assessing and prioritising projects in this plan. To name just a few examples of the value of high quality green space and its cross-cutting impact on a range of outcomes:

- living near a well maintained park has been found to increase the value of the average home by 6%
- owners of small companies rank recreation, parks, and open spaces as the highest priority in choosing new locations for the businesses
- monetary preventative health value through access to recreational opportunities in parks and the growing use of GP referral schemes; all of which contribute to saving the health service millions
- green space contributes to air pollution reduction by absorbing carbon dioxide and producing oxygen and filtering out harmful particulates

This criterion looks at proposed projects through a value for money lens in terms of its impact on a host of economic, health, and environmental outcomes.

8. Meets community goals and aspirations
The recent cooperative parks consultation asked local people and communities what physical developments were needed or would improve
their local park or open space. Over 1,400 responses to this consultation were submitted with the results subsequently held as a good indication of local demand. Where park masterplans exist, the information has also been included, as these plans are also consulted on locally.

More recently these priorities were tested locally through the public consultation on this plan. Those individual schemes that demonstrated strong support have also factored in to the prioritisation in this plan.

9. **Supporting major developments**
Lambeth have some major regeneration schemes planned for local areas, which will have an impact on the local need and usage of a broad range of facilities in our parks and open spaces. Where known, these emerging developments have been mapped against local parks with a view to determining where local area population growth is expected. This assessment has been factored in to this prioritisation framework.

These criteria are by no means the only way to prioritise capital projects in parks. However they have formed a good basis for us to start. It is assumed that this plan would be reviewed halfway through its lifespan to allow us to see what has been delivered and understand where we need to focus our efforts in future. We also plan to refresh the plan after the five year period to ensure projects remain relevant.

This plan should also be seen as a live guide on where improvements should be made across Lambeth’s parks and open spaces and what would represent value for money. It does not preclude community groups or other organisations independently applying for funding for specific projects outside the scope of this plan from external sources; this will only be the framework for council managed or administered funding.

---

**How do community aspirations fit in with cooperative parks plans?**

The cooperative parks programme aims to help communities achieve their aspirations for joint or independent management. This includes taking into account local demand and need for capital improvements as well as considering the form of infrastructure that best supports the new and emerging models of management.

**Level 3:** Independent management of parks is an ambitious goal. The need to generate income and improve infrastructure to sustain and improve park services was a common theme from level three groups, which was a major consideration in this plan along with local demand.

**Level 2:** Cooperative pioneers fed back a host of capital development schemes and projects were selected based on consultation and local demand.

**Level 1:** Where available, capital projects proposed for council-managed parks have been based on evidence, including consultation. Where there is no parks-specific information available, Council officers and the Open Spaces Strategy have informed the plan.
Local Context

Lambeth has a suite of strategies and policies in place to help guide change in the borough, which have implications for the future of parks and open spaces. The plans which have helped shape this plan are listed below.

The Community Plan (2013-2016)

This plan provides the outcomes framework through which the council prioritises resources and drives all the activities that the Council commissions. At the heart of the Community Plan is a commitment to a cooperative approach. ‘Working with the community, drawing much more closely on their experiences and putting residents at the heart of decision making will lead to much better, more cost effective and innovative solutions.’

Cooperative Parks Programme

Lambeth’s Cooperative Parks Programme aims to support opportunities for local communities and residents to lead or have greater responsibilities for service delivery. The Council, in partnership with local Friends of Parks groups, proposed the following three distinct future management models:

- Level 1: Council-led management – traditional approach where the Council continues to maintain and manage parks;
- Level 2: Cooperative management – establishment of a joint partnership arrangement with wide representation, who together make decisions on services and resource allocation
- Level 3: Community-led management – independent management model; the Council adopts a monitoring role

There has been a significant degree of interest in these (and other) alternative models of management from various groups and organisations across the borough. Lambeth are working with these groups to ensure viable service and financial models are explored as part of their development, including discussion on future capital investment options.

Lambeth Local Plan

Policies in planning documents are the basis on which all applications for planning permission are decided. The current local plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (July 2011), the Lambeth Core Strategy (January 2011) and the remaining saved, non-superseded policies in the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP): Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010. The new Lambeth Local Plan is
anticipated to be adopted in early 2015 and will replace the Lambeth Core Strategy and UDP. It involves a partial review of the Core Strategy and contains more detailed development management policies and site allocations. The new Lambeth Local Plan is intended to provide a framework which will guide development leading to significant growth and change in the borough over the next fifteen years. It puts forward a spatial vision and strategic objectives, which are of relevance to future capital spending decisions and negotiations on planning applications. Relevant open space policies include policy EN1 of the new Lambeth Local Plan, and policy S5 of the Core Strategy and saved policy 50 of the UDP. These planning policies seek to protect and maintain open spaces and their function, including biodiversity, and seek also to increase the quantity and quality of open space in the borough. Housing policies seek to make provision for children’s play space.

**Open Spaces Strategy**

Lambeth’s Open Space Strategy forms part of the evidence base for Lambeth’s emerging key planning policy document, the new Local Plan (as described above). In brief, the Strategy provides an assessment of the quantity and quality of existing opens spaces as well as their various functions and significance. It seeks to protect and improve open space provision, including quality, quantity, accessibility and safety; improve linkages within and between existing open space network; meet needs of local people and promote social inclusion; ensure open spaces enhance the quality of the local environment; and provide a framework for future investment priorities and actions to maintain quality and provision.

**Sports and Physical Activity Strategy**

Playing pitch assets are located in approximately one third of Lambeth’s parks and open spaces. Lambeth Council, working with Sport England, have commissioned Knight, Kavanagh & Page (KKP) to complete a Playing Pitch Strategy for the borough from 2014 to 2026. This strategy is being developed with the local community including sports groups, cooperative parks groups, and other community organisations. The strategy is expected to be completed by October 2014 and will be developed working with the community to identify the sustainable management of existing and future sports facilities across the borough. This strategy is required to support our ambition to place the right facilities in the right places and enable the borough to access external funding to support the development of our future sports facilities.

**Playing Pitch Strategy**

The Playing Pitch Strategy will be used to assess relevant planning applications and will form part of the evidence base for future revisions of the Lambeth Local Plan. It will also support the introduction of a Lambeth Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule to provide guidance and the mechanisms whereby new development will be required to contribute to new infrastructure facilities. This will ensure a joined-up approach as part of the planning process and ensure focused future developed against our identified sporting priorities and need.
Community Infrastructure Levy

CIL revenue must be used to fund the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of local areas. Lambeth expects to adopt this levy in 2014.

Area Supplementary Planning Documents

There are a host of area supplementary planning documents that provide a clear vision for individual areas and provide a framework for delivering and managing change. For example, Vauxhall has been identified as an area for significant future growth with plans to create a green spine running through the area, connecting to the linear park.
Local Needs

Open space needs within the borough have been identified through a number of means, including the:

- commission of four area-based needs assessment reports to help build the evidence base for this Plan
- cooperative parks consultation – information was gathered during public events, completion of short and long questionnaires, and during focus groups
- review of current programmes and park master and management plans

An analysis of the evidence has been undertaken to identify areas where improvements will be of the most benefit. The key themes drawn from this review can be summarised as:

- Population - Lambeth will see an increase in size which will impact the demand and need for high quality spaces and facilities
- Density and deprivation – those living in more deprived communities tend to have poorer health and suffer from the kind of illnesses that can be alleviated by regular exposure to green spaces. Ensuring these areas have access to high quality parks and green spaces will help address these issues.
- Safety - high quality public spaces are integral to strategies for dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour issues. An increase in the number of people using parks and open spaces promotes natural surveillance and can result in reduced crime rates.
- Recreation - continued provision for sports and fitness within parks and open spaces to improve health and wellbeing and, where appropriate, provide another source of income into a park
- Quality - maintaining current standards within parks and open spaces, including achieving ‘Green Flag’ status,
- Balance - the need for fairness and achieving a balance of investment across the borough, counteracting any suggestion that investment is concentrated in one location

Brockwell Park Walled Gardens
**Your Involvement**

Lambeth’s shift to a cooperative commissioning model of delivery combined with the development of this Parks Capital Investment Plan has led to a change in the way we plan and deliver capital schemes in parks. No longer will it just be us making decisions about what capital projects are delivered in parks. This new era is about the added touch; about bringing local people in to the design and delivery process in recognition of their value they bring to the green spaces they use.

Local advocacy is not quite enough. As such, we have sought to embed opportunities for local engagement at each development stage, which includes the appointment of two project delivery support officers to work with groups on attracting external investment. This framework makes the case for local engagement and helps everyone understand the contribution communities can make throughout the process. It is a measure of our commitment to strengthen the relationship with residents and genuinely work with you on everything from funding applications to ensuring their successful construction.

Figure 1 depicts our new approach and perhaps more significantly describes how we think it should work. However, we appreciate that this can not be consistently applied for every project and expect flexibility to be built in to best meet the needs of individual groups.

---

### Figure 1: Opportunities for Local Involvement

- **1. Secure Funding**
  - Work with project delivery support officers to agree project and expectations
  - Identify costs, including project management fees
  - Help attract external funding

- **2. Project Design and Scope**
  - Feed into the detailed design, scope, and layout of project
  - Act as the conduit for public consultation
  - Factor in ongoing revenue costs

- **3. Procurement**
  - Help identify potential local providers and stimulate local employment opportunities
  - Advise on new ways of working

- **4. Contract Management**
  - Actively participate in contract management
  - Reflect local views in ongoing delivery

- **5. Successful Delivery**
  - Participate in ensuring project is successfully delivered and to budget
  - Feed back any views on improvements to be made in future

---

You
As this approach represents a new collaborative way of working, we have also generated a set of key principles that will ensure we are making the most of these opportunities. This bottom-up model is intended to help communities develop a sense of ownership and commitment to our parks and open spaces.

**Core Principles**

**Value for Money**

This principle is about having a continual focus on ensuring that money secured, either generated from the Council or otherwise, is spent efficiently and effectively. This is also about considering each scheme in terms of its impact on a range of outcomes from public health improvements to stimulating local growth, and tailoring schemes to maximise the potential.

**Integrity**

This values based principle reflects the borough’s ambition to build trust in the community and expect the same in kind. To deliver the projects in this plan, we need to build a reputation for genuinely listening to your views and we in turn, expect to feel confident that you uphold the same values of trust, openness, and honesty.

**Collaboration with all Users**

We know this is not just about the council working with our dedicated parks groups. There are a host of residents that regularly use our parks who would be interested in what takes place and what is delivered in them. This principle seeks to capture these views and our expectation that you help us reach these groups; hear the perspectives of others.

**Facilitates Local Growth Opportunities**

As a borough, we are committed to supporting the local growth and development opportunities that exist across a range of sectors. Delivering the projects in this plan will begin to seed opportunities for local employment and we want to make sure we capitalise on this. Our communities’ intelligence of local suppliers will be of huge benefit and we want to use this principle to tap into this knowledge base.

---

**Where does my cooperative parks model fit in?**

The capital delivery process may differ depending on the level of responsibility sought under the cooperative parks programme.

**Level 3:** Independent pioneers will need less Council and project delivery officer support and will not need to engage with Council structures to the same extent. Monitoring to ensure safety and legal compliance will remain.

**Level 2:** Cooperative pioneers may need to work more intensively with project support officers, within the Council structures, through each stage of the project delivery process.

**Level 1:** Projects will be delivered as funding or other opportunities become available for Council-managed green spaces (e.g. cross park applications).
North Lambeth

Bishops, Princes and Oval Wards

Area Profile
North Lambeth consists of several smaller places, including Waterloo, Kennington, Oval, and Vauxhall with distinct mainly non-residential neighbourhoods (e.g. Vauxhall and Waterloo), and deprived residential areas separated from the riverside by stations, viaducts and busy roads. As an area it is well known as an entertainment district, especially for the arts, and is a popular tourist destination. North Lambeth also expects the largest population growth over the next few years and is an area of high density development and a key business and cultural hub in the borough.

Waterloo, situated in Bishops ward is one of the borough’s areas of national importance, with a dense concentration of important sites, including Lambeth Palace, a riverside walk that takes in the South Bank arts complex and the London Eye, as well as one of London’s major hospitals, St Thomas’. Jubilee Gardens is also located in Waterloo and is a popular green space independently managed by the Jubilee Gardens Trust and which may see potential expansion into Hungerford Car Park in future.

Vauxhall forms part of the Vauxhall Nine Elms Battersea Opportunity area, the largest current regeneration development in London. This will bring significant numbers of homes and jobs to a currently largely industrial area (although most of this development is in Wandsworth). The intention is to link the riverside east of Battersea Park to Albert Embankment and the South Bank together in a linear park, and to give Vauxhall a stronger, more recognisable local identity - Vauxhall is in both Oval and Princes wards. Proposals for this new linear park include sports pitches, formal and informal children’s play provision, and community growing areas.

Snapshot of Local Parks

Kennington Common in the southern part of the area was until 1800 a notorious site for public executions and meetings. In the Victorian period, the park was redesigned and reopened as Kennington Park and since then the park has been extended although much of the original design has been retained.

Lambeth Palace and Gardens has been the official London residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury since the 13th Century. The palace grounds were opened informally to the public in 1869 to allow local families access to fresh air and green space. The nine acres became known locally as ‘Lambeth Palace Field’ and in 1901 was leased indefinitely to the people of Lambeth and given its current name of Archbishop’s Park.

A network of tree lined open space was later developed along the riverfront forming an extensive public realm, which comprises of the South Bank, Jubilee Gardens, the Albert Embankment and Gardens.

---

2 Scheme to be enabled by Shell Development.
Oval is named after the prestigious cricket ground and has two major open spaces – Vauxhall Park and Kennington Park – both of which have Green Flag status. Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens is also nearby, and is a large open space in Princes ward which also houses Vauxhall City Farm.

Parks and open spaces in North Lambeth include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks/Open Spaces</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Park Plans</th>
<th>Green Flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Park</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>• Master Plan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Green Flag Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishops Park</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>Green Flag Management Plan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens</td>
<td>Princes</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Park</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td>Green Flag Management Plan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufford Street Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Walk Doorstep Green</td>
<td>Princes</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Paradise Gardens (formerly</td>
<td>Princes</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth High St Recreation Ground)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedlars Park</td>
<td>Princes</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Gardens</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Church Gardens</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>Green Flag Management Plan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Cons Gardens</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Marys Church Gardens</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment</td>
<td>Bishops/Princes</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfields Green</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaver Square</td>
<td>Princes</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Green</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Oval</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Marks Churchyard</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claylands Rd Open Space</td>
<td>Oval</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Millennium Green</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Spain Gardens</td>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where do we want to be in ten years?**

A number of themes have been pulled out as relevant for the North Lambeth area. These themes are based on future needs and wrapped around longer-term planning information, including demographic trends, and available research exploring the contribution various capital improvements can make to local outcomes and the associated impact on quality of life.

By setting overarching themes by area, we have attempted to capture and present a strategic view of the future investment needs for local parks in the North Lambeth region, and use this information as the basis for where we should be harnessing and driving our resources over the next five - ten years.

Finally, it is worth bearing in mind that within the North Lambeth neighbourhood, there are two designated neighbourhood cooperative infrastructure levy areas (although these will be reviewed after three years). As mentioned earlier, the community infrastructure levy is a new charge that
allows the council to raise funds from developers undertaking new build projects. This income will be allocated to strategic projects (75% of funds generated) and local neighbourhood projects (remaining 25%), meaning that North Lambeth parks will eventually receive CIL income depending on which CIL area they are in, namely:

- Waterloo CLIP area: Bishops ward
- North Lambeth CLIP area: Prince’s and Oval wards

Although local neighbourhood plans have yet to be developed, it is anticipated that this plan will act as the basis for these Cooperative Local Investment Plans. As such, additional schemes have been included for certain parks across both CLIP areas, where the evidence exists.

I. Increased or enhanced sports and fitness provision

The local area needs assessment for North Lambeth established that there is an under-provision of sports ground/playing fields and games courts in the north of Lambeth. The quantity of provision was found to be disproportionate to the high population density in the area, and that this density was likely to increase in line with the proposed developments in upcoming years.

Looking in detail at the results of the Cooperative Parks Consultation, sports facilities were chosen by almost a quarter of respondents and taken with the results such as those seen in Kennington Park, where users advocated for improved fitness provision in the park, we can see that it remains a key need for the future.

Improvements to sports and fitness provision in parks and open spaces can also provide an excellent social return on investment by influencing a range of outcomes including:

- Health: increased levels of local physical activity participation have a positive relationship with improved health outcomes. This is also a very cost-effective means of promoting health and wellbeing
- Local Decision-Making: provision of an additional revenue stream for reinvestment into park and support future running costs
- Youth Development: providing positive opportunities to divert young people from anti-social behaviour with access to fit-for-purpose sporting infrastructure
- Social Cohesion: parks and open spaces are known to promote community cohesion and sport activities played both formally or informally offer opportunities for this social inclusion to take place

The form of sport and physical activity provision in each park should be informed by the emerging Sports and Physical Activity Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy, although all future schemes will factor in Lambeth’s planning restrictions around turning open space into fenced sports areas.

II. Enriched horticulture and park architecture improvements

Contact with plants and participation in horticultural activities can bring a wide range of benefits to a diverse demographic; increasing local usage of parks and contributing to the uniqueness of an area. For example, it has been found that natural views – of elements such as trees and lakes – promote a

---

3 At the time of drafting this plan, decisions on how the strategic element of CIL had yet to be made.
drop in blood pressure and are shown to reduce feelings of stress. The recognised relationship between green environments and enhanced mental wellbeing lends itself to a focus on this theme in future.

In the cooperative parks consultation, requests for horticultural improvements tended to be largely grouped by park or vicinity. Respondents in the north of the borough for example, were mindful of highlighting the pockets of horticulture and tucked away gardens available as well as point out the local ‘horticultural centres of excellence’ in the Royal Horticultural Society and the Garden Museum as a guide for future improvements. As the population density increases, these centres should be maximised and brought in to help guide discussions that aim to build up and sustain the ‘green lungs’ of the area and create a collection of enriched parks and open spaces.

Investment in hard infrastructure and landscaping as part of a planned approach would also make major contributions to the quality of parks and open spaces. These range from the potential to generate future savings (e.g. from schemes such as improved drainage) to the provision of high quality built facilities that improve the accessibility or visual appearance and attractiveness of local parks, subsequently increasing their usage. Improving access routes for the purpose of promoting connectivity between the many small spaces in North Lambeth is also a future priority, given that the quantity of green space provision in this area is low. Bearing in mind the high and surging population density, the need for linkages across existing parks (particularly Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens, Vauxhall Park, and Larkhall Park in keeping with the VNEB development) becomes more important.

Finally, parks and open spaces have an important role to play in furthering the sustainability agenda. Given the number of green spaces in North Lambeth, there are some small interventions that can make a difference to the local environment, largely in terms of improving air quality in an urban environment and exploring the role green spaces can play in waste management. We know that plant life and trees help reduce pollutants in the air and there are also natural biological systems for waste (e.g. mulching with locally produced woodchip and compost) that can make an urban environment more self-sustaining.

III. Improvements to children’s’ play facilities

Play is an essential part of the physical, emotional, and psychological development of children and in urban environments, the opportunities for play are restricted. Today, parks are the primary outdoor environment that still remains for children to meet and play in a sociable and informal setting. Perhaps unsurprisingly, children’s play area was identified as a need by the highest proportion of respondents to the cooperative parks Consultation for both the short questionnaire and the face to face survey (26% and 24%). This was of particular note by a number of Vauxhall Park users who identified the play area as being in need of improvement.

Well-designed play areas with a range of equipment and landscaping can provide places where whole families can enjoy quality time together. They also provide settings for family or neighbourhood interactions and as a free, outdoor activity, playgrounds allow local people to meet

---


5 Urban Parks Forum. (2002). Your Parks: the benefits of parks and green space
and extend social networks. This will be especially important in the north of the borough which will experience major population growth in the coming years; a significant proportion of which will be comprised of affordable housing.

**Where do we start?**

Across our stock of parks and open spaces there are a range of capital improvement schemes already underway or in the pipeline, which contribute to improving the quality and accessibility of our parks and open spaces. These projects are often developed and delivered as part of either section 106 funding or larger Lottery applications and shaped in partnership with local communities.

Table 1 presents these live capital schemes:

**Table 1: Capital Projects in the Pipeline in North Lambeth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Indicative Cost (000)</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Archbishops Park      | Sports Facility Improvement Programme:  
  - upgrade redundant football redgra pitches so fit for purpose
  - construct changing rooms
  - resurface tennis and netball courts
  - upgrade outdoor gym equipment
  - table tennis table provision | £900 | Oct 2015 |
| Hatfields Green       | Whole park redevelopment project to improve the open space, including pathways, seating, water installation (match funded by Southwark Council to tune of £100k) | £275 | Mar 2015 |
| Jubilee Gardens       | Expansion into Hungerford car park                                                        |                       |                    |
| Kennington Park       | Implementation of refurbishment of walled ornamental flower garden                          | £500 in total:  
  - £375 of HLF;  
  - £82 of S106;  
  - £50 of in-kind from Friends KP | Mar 2016 |
|                       | Improved footpaths and pathway across park to Bolton Crescent and Mead Road               | £33⁶ | Mar 2015 |
|                       | Relocation of composting area in Kennington Park (to be managed through waste reduction grant) | £32 | Mar 2016 |
| Vauxhall Park         | Park masterplan development                                                                | £33⁷ | Mar 2015 |
| Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens | Implementation of next stage of major regeneration scheme, including:  
  - Reducing the mounds 
  - Art installation statues on to of entrance columns | £440 | Mar 2016 |
|                       | Goding Street Improvements project – exploratory scheme to look at means of animating spaces | £30 | TBC |

**Total** | £2,243 |

However, alongside these developments are the host of capital improvement schemes that are currently unfunded (or partly funded) and which based on local evidence, park user feedback and existing park master plans, are of urgent need to improve local outcomes and help support the delivery of the cooperative parks programme. These schemes have been evaluated using the prioritisation criteria described earlier and narrowed down to key priority proposals for each park.

---

⁶ Consists of 2 project specific S106 public realm agreements worth £10,790 and £23,745 respectively.
⁷ This sum is part of a bigger S106 agreement, which is being shared between a master plan and as a contribution to the Vauxhall Park children’s play project.
and open space as listed in the Table 2. below. As might be expected, smaller green spaces have fewer projects assigned, unless there was a demonstrable need identified in the cooperative parks consultation or seen in available evidence. It is expected that this will be a live guide of priority projects, which is updated as funding becomes available. The aspiration is to deliver as much as possible over the next five years.

At the time of drafting this Plan, plans were underway to extend the Northern Line to Battersea. This is part of the broader regeneration of the area and will involve the sale of Kennington Lodge. The funding resulting from this will be ring fenced for investment in parks.

**Guidance to Interpreting the Table**

- Projects have been kept relatively broad to enable flexibility and discussion with local groups on detail
- The *Estimated Cost* column is purely indicative and based on the cost of installing or building similar capital improvements in other parks
- The *S106 Available* column refers to where S106 funding has and will continue to be matched to projects that meet the requirements. This will be updated as S106 funding comes in.
- The *Other Available* column refers to Lambeth capital funding, grant funding, local contributions, or other funding streams that are made available. As discussed earlier in the plan, the Lambeth capital funding has been allocated to projects that most strongly meet the prioritisation criteria. Where other funding sources have been obtained (e.g. grant funding) this has been listed.
- The *Budget Needed* column refers to the outstanding amount that needs to be raised or found externally to deliver the project.
- The *Funded* column depicts the schemes that are able to be financed and delivered at the time of drafting this plan. This will be updated as schemes are completed.
- Bolded rows refer to the three highest priority projects for the neighbourhood area.

### Table 2: North Lambeth Region Projects to be Delivered from 2014/15 – 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Themed Outcome</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (000)</th>
<th>S106 Available</th>
<th>Budget (000)</th>
<th>Other Available</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Enhanced planting and horticultural improvements</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishops Park</td>
<td>Access and Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved entrances and landscaping</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horticultural and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Enhanced planting and bedding</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Building; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Conversion of public toilet block into café</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Spain Gardens</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Improved bedding and park furniture</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaver Square</td>
<td>Park Architecture</td>
<td>Improved furniture and drainage works</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Cons Garden</td>
<td>Park Architecture</td>
<td>Paving installation that differentiates the space</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfields Green</td>
<td>Access and Park Architecture</td>
<td>Improved furniture</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Green</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>As detailed in TFL design plans</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Area</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Oval</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>General improvements to create an attractive and welcoming environment</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Park</td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td><strong>Outdoor fitness equipment</strong> Development of extension, including possible construction of sports pavilion</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Architecture and Landscaping</td>
<td>Improvements to pathways and land drainage, including public toilet provision</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TFL: £800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved and more modern children’s play area</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£17.5</td>
<td>£232.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Walk Doorstep Green</td>
<td>Access and Park Architecture</td>
<td>Improved signage and cycling route</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Improved sports and leisure facilities</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Paradise Gardens</td>
<td>Access and Park Architecture</td>
<td>Restoration of surrounding listed walls</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Horticultural design improvements</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedlar’s Park</td>
<td>Access and Park Architecture</td>
<td>Improved park furniture and signage</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved play equipment for children</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s Church Garden</td>
<td>Access and Park Architecture</td>
<td>Improved signage and furniture</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark’s Churchyard</td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Installation of new play area</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Widened pathways, gravel, and railings that supports local activity</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s Church Garden</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Improved water feature systems, fencing, and improved pathways</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufford Street Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Improved bedding and furniture, including fencing and seating</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£9.5</td>
<td>£40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved children’s playground</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Park</td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td><strong>Modernised play area provision</strong></td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved sports and fitness facilities</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture and Architecture</td>
<td>Horticultural designs, sustainability, and improved furniture and access</td>
<td></td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Will explore potential to secure Sporting National Governing Body contribution to scheme*
This list of capital schemes are not exhaustive by any means; the proposals more provide an indication of each park’s immediate capital investment needs, which include consideration of issues related to historical lack of investment or upcoming developments that may significantly impact on park usage. The proposed projects have also been suggested in the context of Lambeth’s Local Plan (draft) Infrastructure Schedule which aims to support future growth.

However before we start, we also need to emphasise the importance of considering the ongoing revenue costs of individual projects going forward, particularly now, in this financial climate. We have committed to only investing capital monies in schemes that either already have revenue budgets attached or have an associated plan for generating income that can be used to cover the ongoing maintenance costs. Such approaches will include reviewing the opportunities for competitive tender packages (e.g. sports facilities) that factor in clear maintenance expectations.

The top three projects across North Lambeth parks (bolded in Table 2. above) assessed to be of highest priority are also provided in further detail below.

---

9 Sum consists of 2 S106 public realm improvement agreements consisting of £65,690 and £34,600 in local area.
Proposed Project Details:
Outdoor Fitness Equipment in Kennington Park

Description:
Kennington Park’s existing outdoor fitness equipment was installed in 2006 and needs urgent attention. Owing to its condition and regularity of usage, it needs to be replaced with more durable equipment.

Justification:
Kennington Park’s outdoor fitness equipment is damaged or broken owing to overuse and has now become unsafe. There is a dedicated user group regularly using the equipment who have lobbied the Council both through the cooperative parks consultation and as a separate petition to have this equipment replaced. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Assessed as an emerging health and safety issue based on independent assessments
- Meets community needs as evident by recent user group formed around the equipment and strong local support for scheme
- Contributes to positive opportunities for enhanced public health and wellbeing given the growing popularity of fitness equipment in parks and its obvious link to healthy living. Also, as a largely user managed facility, adds to community cohesion.

Capital Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£50,000 for construction and installation</td>
<td>£106 sports and leisure contribution in area: £35,200</td>
<td>£14,800 to be found through community activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
It is expected that any outdoor fitness equipment installed will include an associated revenue budget before construction commences or a plan to cover any ongoing costs through income generating activities (e.g. fitness training programmes). This budget should cover at a minimum, programmed safety inspections. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to equipment for at least ten years.
Proposed Project Details:
Modernised play area provision in Vauxhall Park

Description:
The proposed project acknowledges that the play area which was installed in 2004 is worn out and in need of refurbishment.

Justification:
Play areas have an acknowledged life span of between 10-15 years and the playground in Vauxhall Park is over 10 years old and has unfortunately reached the end of its life. As a result local discussions on the form and design of a new play area have begun with the Friends of Vauxhall Park, as part of work on a new masterplan for the park. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Located in a major development area (Vauxhall Nine Elms area) which is expected to see a surge in residential population. This area regeneration will have a big impact on need and usage of park facilities and a modernised play facility will support the increased visitors.
- Scheme is supported by results of the cooperative parks consultation, which found local demand for improved play area in Vauxhall Park.
- The role a good playground can play in enhancing children’s’ health and wellbeing is well documented as it offers opportunities for interaction, space, and healthy activity.
- There has been a historic lack of capital investment in the past and this project as well as the masterplan starts to address some of these issues.

Capital Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£250,000 for design and construction</td>
<td>£25,000 of a £58,000 S106 Parks Improvement obligation remains (funds spent previously on park masterplan)</td>
<td>£225,000 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
It is expected that all play facilities that are designed and built will have a low maintenance specification attached (e.g. no sand or water based activity and low maintenance horticulture). In addition, there should either be an associated revenue budget attached or a plan for income generated from other activities or services in the park to be used to cover ongoing costs (e.g. café). This should cover programmed safety inspections (e.g. ROPSA) and any minor repairs to equipment. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to equipment.
Proposed Project Details:
Design and improve pathway infrastructure and landscape in Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens

Description:
Improvements to, and widening of, pathways and reduction of the mounds to support increased numbers and provide event space

Justification:
Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens has produced an urban design framework that aims to regenerate the park, bearing in mind the impact expected following the Vauxhall Nine Elms development. Although work has begun on some public realm improvements, improvements to landscaping infrastructure is needed to support the increased numbers and improve community safety (through reduction in mounds). This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Located in a major development area (Vauxhall Nine Elms area) which is expected to see a surge in residential population. This area regeneration will have a big impact on need and usage of park facilities and a modernised play facility will support the increased visitors.
- As part of the Urban Design Framework, this project will start to open up future revenue generation potential in line with plans to use the space as a natural amphitheatre for outdoor theatre performances
- Scheme will enhance the reputation of the borough based on the rising profile of the park and the increasing numbers of visitors that head to Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens for range of events, including summer fetes or outdoor cinema shows

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£250,000 for construction and installation</td>
<td>£100,290 made up of two S106 contributions: Public realm improvements in local area</td>
<td>£149,700 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
There is not expected to be any additional operational or revenue costs associated with this scheme as there is no additional grass, bedding, or new facilities being built. Despite this fact, revenue budgets remain under pressure so all improvement schemes are expected to have, or factor in, an associated revenue budget or include a plan for raising income from investment. In this case, the income generated from events or activities should be used to offset grass maintenance and potential damage costs.
**Brixton and Herne Hill**

**Coldharbour, Herne Hill, Tulse Hill, Brixton Hill Wards**

**Area Profile**
Brixton and Herne Hill is the most heavily populated area of the borough. Brixton is the main and most populous town centre at the heart of Lambeth with around 71,000 residents. It was once predominantly woodland, only marked by a stone, and was thought to have been a meeting place located on Brixton Hill. At the end of the 18th Century, settlement and villages began to enclose Brixton and the woodland was eventually cleared leaving farmland and market gardens, to serve the City of London and City of Westminster as the only open areas. It has since developed a reputation as a diverse cultural and creative centre, famous for its entertainment venues, thriving high street, and markets. It is identified in the London Plan as one of the 35 major centres and in recent years, has undergone re-development, including the redevelopment of Windrush Square, pavement widening, improved lighting and road systems, and the regeneration of Brixton market.

Although the most deprived areas are spread throughout the borough, there is a particular concentration in this area cluster as seen in Coldharbour ward.

**Snapshot of Local Parks**
Brockwell Park, situated between Brixton, Tulse Hill and Herne Hill, developed from the parkland associated with the Grade II* listed Brockwell Hall built in 1813. Residential settlement was focused on surrounding the park as Tulse Hill and Herne Hill became popular with business people in the late 18th – early 19th Century. Historic features include refurbished walled gardens, and a wide range of sports facilities including a refurbished 1930’s Lido, a BMX track, and tennis courts. The park has hosted the Lambeth Country Show since 1974 and has been a recipient of Heritage Lottery Funding.

Ruskin Park, in Herne Hill, is a large Edwardian park (c.1907) which was laid out by J.J Sexby and named after John Ruskin. It has many intact heritage features alongside sports and community facilities and provides respite for workers, visitors, and patients of the adjacent Kings College and Maudsley Hospitals. Both Brockwell Park and Ruskin Park are Green Flag parks and residents from relevant ward are predictably more likely to visit parks and open spaces.

There are a range of other nearby open spaces in this central patch that have their own unique characteristics. For example, Rush Common, a remnant of common land, forms a corridor of green space through Brixton, through to St Matthew’s Church Gardens and Windrush Square in the town centre and Loughborough Park and Wyck Gardens, home of Ebony Horse Club, as you move further north. Full list of parks in Brixton and Herne Hill region are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks/Open Spaces</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Park Plans</th>
<th>Green Flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockwell Park</td>
<td>Herne Hill</td>
<td>HLF Management and Maintenance Plan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Park</td>
<td>Herne Hill</td>
<td>Green Flag Management Plan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Common</td>
<td>Brixton Hill/Tulse Hill</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Park</td>
<td>Coldharbour</td>
<td>Masterplan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Gardens</td>
<td>Brixton Hill</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where do we want to be in ten years?
A number of themes have been pulled out as relevant for the Brixton and Herne Hill area. These themes are based on future needs and wrapped around longer-term planning information, including demographic trends, and available research exploring the contribution various capital improvements can make to local outcomes and the associated impact on quality of life.

By setting overarching themes by area, we have attempted to capture and present a strategic view of the future investment needs for local parks in the Brixton and Herne Hill region, and use this information as the basis for where we should be harnessing and driving our resources over the next 10 – 15 years.

I. Improved play facilities, with a focus on areas of high population density and deprivation

Parks are renowned settings for play and exploration, both of which are essential means of education and connecting with the natural environment in a free and accessible classroom.

However, upon review, many parks and open spaces in the central region of the borough do not appear to have play facilities that encourage usage, meaning that many residents are not obtaining the benefits that play can provide, including developing imagination and skills and encouraging risk taking. This finding was reinforced by the cooperative parks consultation that identified children’s play areas as the greatest need by the highest proportion of respondents.

We know that play areas provide opportunities for free and accessible play interaction, which is particularly important where families are on low incomes. Those living in the most deprived areas are spread throughout the borough but are particularly concentrated in Coldharbour ward. For example, the percentage of dependent children receiving tax credits in lone parent families in Coldharbour was 63% compared to the borough average of 47.9%. The area based needs assessment for Brixton also highlighted the fact that there are very poor facilities in terms of open space in Tulse Hill ward, which also happens to be one of the most densely populated residential areas in the borough. In fact, a number of the respondents to the cooperative parks consultation specified improved play provision in Rush Common, a piece of open space that serves the residents of both Tulse Hill and Brixton Hill wards. Play provision in Windmill Gardens is an additional scheme that will warrant attention in future.

II. Improvements to heritage features and buildings

As a borough, Lambeth is fortunate to benefit from a range of historic buildings and sites that have the ability to retell our heritage and inject life into the build environment. Our parks are no
different, in that they have an element of historic association through monuments or buildings that tell the stories of local communities. There are a range of such heritage features in the Brixton and Herne Hill area, which imbue the local area with a distinctive charm and are worth reviving. Brixton Windmill or the Portico in Ruskin Park for example, are two such heritage features that increase sense of pride in a local area and enhance the reputation of the borough.

Whilst enhancing our historic park features are important to retaining the character of a park and creating a sense of place, improvements to park buildings can serve another useful purpose. We can see that the landscape for public service delivery is changing as local authority budgets inevitably reduce in line with reductions in overall public sector expenditure. This has meant that we can not continue funding our parks services in the same way. The cooperative parks programme is our response; it aims to support local decision-making or community-managed parks, as a means of ensuring that available monies are spent more effectively and to help mitigate the scale of financial cuts up ahead. However, to realistically support devolution to local communities, we need to explore alternative income generation models that allow new sources of revenue to be reinvested into the park. This is where reimagining of our park assets and their future use steps in.

Parks and open spaces in the Brixton and Herne Hill cluster have expressed a high level of interest in cooperative or community-led management models. There are also a host of assets which, with some innovative thought, could provide a new revenue stream that funds necessary maintenance and improvements. The cooperative parks consultation reinforced this point with the number of Ruskin Park users who highlighted the need for improved café facilities in the park whilst pointing out the potential of the old stable block.

**Where do we start?**

Across our stock of parks and open spaces there are a range of capital improvement schemes already underway or in the pipeline, which contribute to improving the quality and accessibility of our parks and open spaces. These projects are often developed and delivered as part of either section 106 funding or larger Lottery applications and shaped in partnership with local communities. Table 3 presents these live capital schemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Indicative Cost (000)</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyck Gardens</td>
<td>Improved entrances, including planting and seating and signage</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, alongside these developments are the host of capital improvement schemes that are currently unfunded (or partly funded) and which based on local evidence, park user feedback and existing park master plans, are of urgent need to improve local outcomes and help support the delivery of the cooperative parks programme. For example, the Brixton and Herne Hill region is fortunate to benefit from several emerging cooperative parks pioneers who are exploring necessary capital investment requirements to help their longer term business planning and the development of viable financial plans. These schemes have been evaluated using the prioritisation criteria described earlier and narrowed down to key priority proposals for each park and open space as listed in Table 4. below. As might be expected, smaller green spaces have fewer projects assigned, unless there was a demonstrable need identified in the cooperative parks consultation or seen in available
evidence. It is expected that this will be a live guide of priority projects, which is updated as funding becomes available. The aspiration is to deliver as much as possible over the next five years.

**Guidance to Interpreting the Table**

- Projects have been kept relatively broad to enable flexibility and discussion with local groups on detail
- **Estimated Cost** column is purely indicative and based on the cost of installing or building similar capital improvements in other parks
- **S106 Available** column refers to where S106 funding has and will continue to be matched to projects that meet the requirements. This will be updated as S106 funding comes in.
- **Other Available** column refers to Lambeth capital funding, grant funding, or other funding streams that are made available. As discussed earlier in the plan, the Lambeth capital funding has been allocated to projects that most strongly meet the prioritisation criteria. Where other funding sources have been obtained (e.g. grant funding) this has been listed.
- **Budget Needed** column refers to the outstanding amount that needs to be raised or found externally to deliver the project.
- **Funded** column depicts the schemes that are able to be financed and delivered at the time of drafting this plan. This will be updated as schemes are completed.
- **Bolded rows** refer to the three highest priority projects for the neighbourhood area.

### Table 4: Brixton and Herne Hill Region Projects to be Delivered from 2014/15 – 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Themed Outcome</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (000)</th>
<th>S106 Available</th>
<th>Other Available</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockwell Park</td>
<td>Functional Buildings; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Brockwell Hall regeneration</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£46</td>
<td>VAMS: £10</td>
<td>Health and Safety: £170</td>
<td>£1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of park assets based on feasibility study</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£155</td>
<td>Grant: £355</td>
<td>VAMS: £448</td>
<td>£42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved sports and fitness facilities, including review of football redgra pitches</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour Lane Open Space</td>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>Public art installation linked to local club activity</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Court Gardens</td>
<td>Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improvements to hard landscaping</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam Street Open Space</td>
<td>Diversified Usage</td>
<td>Provide capital investment linked to future community management model</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmewood Gardens</td>
<td>Horticulture and Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved aesthetics, including planting and paths, fencing, lighting, and furniture</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost 1</td>
<td>Cost 2</td>
<td>Cost 3</td>
<td>Amount Available</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Park</td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improvements to play facilities</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£178.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision; Community Safety</td>
<td>Refurbishment of sports facilities to support increased use, including fencing</td>
<td>£80</td>
<td>£10.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£69.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Roach Park</td>
<td>Hard Landscaping and Community Safety</td>
<td>Redesign of layout of park, including furniture and fittings</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkwood Road Open Space</td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Provision of outdoor gym</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Infrastructure Provision</td>
<td>Explore building provision to support community management</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£57.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£142.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Common</td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Provision of play facilities</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£14.5</td>
<td>£135.5</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved paths, walls, and seating</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Park</td>
<td>Functional Buildings; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Conversion of the stable block</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Feature</td>
<td>Restoration of portico</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Improved and upgraded sports and fitness facility offer across the park, including changing facilities</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>£17.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£782.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthews Church Gardens</td>
<td>Improved Infrastructure</td>
<td>Restore fountain, including water recycling</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved landscaping and infrastructure, including restoration of tombs and monuments</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Gardens</td>
<td>Building Infrastructure Provision Revenue Support</td>
<td>Explore new building provision to support education programme delivery</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved and modernised children’s play facilities</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Appearance Improvements</td>
<td>Work to improve aesthetics and facilitate use</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windrush Square</td>
<td>Functional Buildings</td>
<td>Improvements to public toilet block to support use</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horticulture and Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved planting and furniture and fittings, including bins</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Two S106 agreements valued at £116,500 in total but which are paid through phased payment schedule – sum listed is amount available at time of drafting plan.
11 Sports and Leisure S106 grant is valued at £80,093 but which is paid through phased payment schedule. Listed sum is available at time of drafting plan.
12 Consists of two S106 children and young peoples play space obligations wroth £6,533 and £7,932 respectively.
This list of priority projects are not exhaustive by any means; the proposals more provide an indication of each park’s immediate capital investment needs, which include consideration of cooperative or community-led management ambitions, community feedback, and the demographics of the local area to help us assess current and projected patterns of usage. The proposed projects have also been suggested in the context of Lambeth’s Local Plan (draft) Infrastructure Schedule which aims to support future growth.

However before we start, we also need to emphasise the importance of considering the ongoing revenue costs of individual projects going forward, particularly now, in this financial climate. We have committed to only investing capital monies in schemes that either already have revenue budgets attached or have an associated plan for generating income that can be used to cover the ongoing maintenance costs. Such approaches will include reviewing the opportunities for competitive tender packages (e.g. sports facilities) that factor in clear maintenance expectations.

The top three projects across parks in the Brixton and Herne Hill region (in bold in Table above) that are assessed to be of highest priority are also provided in further detail below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wyck Gardens</th>
<th>Hard Landscaping</th>
<th>Improved fencing surrounding park and park furniture</th>
<th>£150</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>£150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£7,040</td>
<td>£322.1</td>
<td>£1,468.5</td>
<td>£5,249.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Project Details:
Conversion of the stable block in Ruskin Park

Description:
Stable Block is a remnant of the old villa landscape in the new park layout. It was abandoned as staff accommodation due to its poor condition but it has significant potential for re-use, with proposals from parks users to convert it into a community café with toilets and community facilities for hire.

Justification:
Transformation of this dilapidated building will not only ensure the historic heritage of the park is maintained, but it will provide a sheltered community space for visitors to relax whilst offering an additional revenue stream that can be reinvested back into the park; integral as a new management model for this park is being explored. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- The new development will not only bring an unused building back into regular use, but will support the park’s plans for a new management structure; start to open up new sources of income through its plans to provide café provision and hire space for local arts or physical activity sessions (e.g. Pilates classes)
- Ruskin Park has received little investment in the past and has consequently slowly fallen into disrepair. This project starts to redress this underinvestment and bring more life back into the park
- Both the cooperative parks consultation and the recent period of consultation on the draft plan seeded a substantial amount of local support for this scheme. In fact, a user group has already formed around the scheme to explore designs and usage options.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£750,000 for construction/conversion costs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£750,000 to be found through council investment and other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with the building (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). The new management model for our parks looks to ring fence the income generated from parks and reinvest it back in to park operations and services. With this in mind, it is expected that the income generated from this new development will be recycled both back into the ongoing building expenditure as well as into Ruskin Park operational activities, given the pressures on revenue budgets. This revenue plan should be included in the overall capital development plans for this project and should cover programmed and reactive maintenance at a minimum. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the new building.
Proposed Project Details:
Provision of play facilities in Rush Common

Description:
Currently Rush Common’s play facilities include swings and a slide. Significant investment is needed to design and construct an innovative play area that brings enjoyment to local people and is of a high quality, promoting inclusivity across the green space.

Justification:
Rush Common is a central yet historically underinvested green space that warrants attention and feedback from the cooperative parks consultation specifically referenced the need to install a modernised playground. Ultimately this project aims to provide further opportunities for more positive use of this green corridor.

This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Scheme is supported by results of the cooperative parks consultation, which found local demand for improved play area in Rush Common.
- The role a good playground can play in enhancing children’s’ health and wellbeing is well documented as it offers opportunities for interaction, space, and healthy activity
- There has been a historic lack of capital investment in the past and this project starts to address some of these issues
- Rush Common is located in an area of deprivation and given that outcomes tend to be worse than for people living in less deprived areas, providing a positive facility was prioritised.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£150,000 for design and construction</td>
<td>£14,466 across two S106 agreements:</td>
<td>£135,530 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribution to children and young people’s play space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:

It is expected that all play facilities that are designed and built will have a low maintenance specification attached (e.g. no sand or water based activity and low maintenance horticulture) that seeks to minimise ongoing revenue costs (newer condition). In addition, the development plans should include an associated revenue budget that covers programmed safety inspections (e.g. ROPSA) and any minor repairs to equipment. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to equipment.
**Proposed Project Details:**
Construct a building in Windmill Gardens to support education programme

**Description:**
Working with the Friends, provide a building that supports Windmill’s education programme and enables delivery of both community and hospitality events.

**Justification:**
Brixton Windmill was the recipient of an HLF grant to provide an educational activities programme focusing on the Windmill, which is soon to reach its end. To ensure this can continue, an education centre building that facilitates activities including flour milling, space for school children, offices, and the sale of bread, all of which will help generate revenue for the park is needed. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Windmill Gardens is located in an area of severe deprivation and given that outcomes tend to be worse than for people living in less deprived areas, providing a positive facility that reaches out to all sections of the community is prioritised.
- The recent period of consultation on the draft plan seeded a substantial amount of local support for this scheme as a means of growing the programme and involving more local schools; to that effect, the friends have even put together proposals for the building.
- Education building will allow the friends to expand their education programme utilising this historic asset and start to open up new sources of income through its plans to bring in further schools, provide cooking and food education capacity linking to flour milling, and provide hire space for children’s activities.

**Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£350,000 for design and construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£350,000 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenue Costs:**
There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with the building (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). The new management model for our parks looks to ring fence the income generated from parks and reinvest it back in to park operations and services. With this in mind, it is expected that the income generated from expanded operations this new development will offer, will be recycled both back into the ongoing building expenditure as well as into Windmill Gardens operational activities, given the pressures on revenue budgets. This revenue plan should be included in the overall capital development plans for this project and should cover programmed and reactive maintenance at a minimum. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the new building.
Clapham and Stockwell

Ferndale, Stockwell, Vassal, Larkhall, Clapham Town, Clapham Common, Thornton Wards

Area Profile
From the mid-19th Century, a pattern of residential development in Clapham began to emerge with housing laid out in loose grid patterns, crescents and squares with a focus on central gardens and shrubberies. Substantial redevelopment took place in the latter half of the 20th century as a consequence of bomb damage sustained during World War II. Stockwell and Larkhall comprise predominantly post-war high rise residential blocks, which form large clusters of buildings within planned estates set in a complex network of small amenity spaces. Small pockets of low rise industrial buildings remain within the area, located closer to the river.

Clapham and Stockwell are now areas of extremes with prosperous young commuters and less affluent tenants of social housing living in close proximity. There are roughly 43,000 residents in the town centre with some of Lambeth’s most expensive housing in Clapham Town and Clapham Common wards. However, Clapham also contains large areas of social housing and pockets of deprivation, in particular within Thornton ward. Clapham Town has a vibrant night time economy. Stockwell is a mixed area with approximately 46,000 residents and is home to one of Britain’s largest Portuguese communities.

There is also expected to be some knock-on impact in Stockwell from the planned Vauxhall regeneration development in London. Although parks in this neighbourhood are outside the set opportunity area, it is expected that parks such as Larkhall Park, which have well used sports facilities will be under pressure from the increased numbers of residents in the area.

Snapshot of Local Parks
There are a range of large, medium and smaller parks and open spaces in the Clapham and Stockwell area which have received varied levels of investment in recent years. Clapham Common was converted to public parkland in the late 19th century and is one of London’s largest open spaces. The Common performs an essential role as both an area of biodiversity and one that supports a range of popular events and leisure and recreation opportunities. Myatt’s Field Park is Victorian listed and has undergone major renovation following investment from the Heritage Lottery Funding as well as significant improvements recently delivered in Slade Gardens and Larkhall Park.

There are also smaller green spaces that are surrounded by residential areas and development patterns such as Grafton Square, Lansdowne Gardens, and the green flag award space - St. Pauls Churchyard.

Range of parks and open spaces include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks/Open Spaces</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Park Plans</th>
<th>Green Flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common</td>
<td>Clapham Common</td>
<td>Masterplan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall Park</td>
<td>Larkhall</td>
<td>Masterplan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where do we want to be in ten years?

A number of themes have been pulled out as relevant for the Clapham and Stockwell area. These themes are based on future needs and wrapped around longer-term planning information, including demographic trends, and available research exploring the contribution various capital improvements can make to local outcomes and the associated impact on quality of life.

By setting overarching themes by area, we have attempted to capture and present a strategic view of the future investment needs for local parks in the Clapham and Stockwell region, and use this information as the basis for where we should be harnessing and driving our resources towards over the next five - ten years.

I. Enhanced sports and fitness provision

From the Cooperative Parks Consultation, sports facilities were chosen by almost a quarter of respondents. This finding is met by a growing understanding that as a borough, Lambeth does not have the number and range of sport and physical activity facilities to meet rising demand. For example, the need for changing rooms to support regular matches or games in Clapham Common is a common appeal by local sports clubs, which was again reinforced in the cooperative parks consultation. The emerging Sports and Physical Activity Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy will help us understand where these gaps in sporting provision lie and will ultimately inform the sports development arm of this Plan; however it is also worth including here to ensure it remains a key guiding principle for the future, given the results of cooperative parks consultation, the established popularity of sporting activities in parks in the Clapham and Stockwell region, and the upcoming residential developments in Clapham.

Improvements to sports and fitness provision in parks and open spaces can also provide an excellent social return on investment by influencing a range of outcomes including:

- Health: increased levels of local physical activity has a positive relationship with improved health outcomes and represents a cost-effective means of promoting health and wellbeing
- Local Decision-Making: provision of an additional revenue stream for reinvestment into park and support future running costs, which will be of particular value for parks pioneers
- Youth Development: providing positive opportunities to divert young people from anti-social behaviour with access to fit-for-purpose sporting infrastructure
- Social Cohesion: parks are known to promote community cohesion and sport activities played both formally or informally offer opportunities for social inclusion to take place
During the public consultation on the draft plan, the council also received some comments specifically related to the need for further skate park provision. There is already a relatively new and well used skate park in Clapham Common; however local views were that the wealth of other skate parks, such as Stockwell skate park should be improved to meet local demand.

II. Improvements to horticulture and biodiversity

In the Clapham and Stockwell region, the range of public green spaces are extensive, ranging from large expanses of common land, to parks, community open spaces, gardens, and churchyards. This diversity in the local green environment makes them particularly valuable to the surrounding population and the wealth of wildlife it supports. In the cooperative parks consultation, requests for horticultural improvements tended to be largely grouped by park with users of Clapham Common for example, expressing a keen interest in horticulture and landscape improvements. Horticultural schemes are worthwhile as they can help improve the park or open space and raise its decorative value as well as bring a wide range of benefits to a diverse demographic. For example, participation in horticultural improvements is a useful environment for people with social care needs to engage in a park, as they provide a safe and risk-managed environment as well as providing natural therapy (e.g. therapeutic horticulture projects targeted at people with disabilities). Looking to the future, this would prove helpful for budding cooperative parks pioneers as a way of ensuring high levels of maintenance continue. Future focus for landscape infrastructure improvements in Clapham and Stockwell parks and open spaces should look to remove access restrictions to green spaces and promote connectivity.

Protecting and enhancing biodiversity also lends itself to attracting volunteers as a tangible and visible means of helping preserve our valuable natural habitats for all forms of wildlife. This investment specifically refers to sustaining ecosystems which develop around a local natural habitat, which in urban parks are invariably woodlands, ponds, allotments, and other environments that support a rich variety of life. Initial suggestions for parks and open spaces have revolved around drainage, soil, and grass improvements, which would again help reduce ongoing maintenance costs and long-term reliance on Council funding.

The recognised relationship between green environments and enhanced mental wellbeing lends itself to a focus on this theme in future. Its attention in future would also make major contributions to the visual appearance and attractiveness of local parks, subsequently increasing their usage.

How do we start?
Across our stock of parks and open spaces there are a range of capital improvement schemes underway or in the pipeline, which contribute to improving the quality and accessibility of our parks and open spaces. These projects are often developed and delivered as part of either section 106 funding or larger Lottery applications and shaped in partnership with local communities. Table 5 presents these live capital schemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Indicative Cost (000)</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common</td>
<td>• Outdoor fitness equipment installation across Common</td>
<td>£235</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refurbishment of Rookery Road courts to ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
facilities are fit for purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall Park</td>
<td>• Modernised and upgraded children’s under 5 play area</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>Sep 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved landscaping and provision of park furniture and equipment, including gym equipment and benches</td>
<td>£31</td>
<td>Mar 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slade Gardens</td>
<td>Implementation of Phase 2 of Master Plan:</td>
<td>£399</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements to Ingleborough Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a nature trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• path networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• trim trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• park furniture, including benches and interpretative signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• new central paved area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>Landscaping improvements, including series of small projects to upgrade assets</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total £777.4

However, alongside these developments are the host of capital improvement schemes that are currently unfunded and which based on local evidence, park user feedback and existing park master plans, are of urgent need to improve local outcomes and help support the delivery of the cooperative parks programme. As highlighted above, Clapham and Stockwell contain a variety of parks of different sizes and needs, which again cater for different audiences. It is clear that aside from the Clapham Common ward, the accessibility of open space in this area is poor and that a focus on facilities is needed, either from the addition of new facilities or the replacement or repair of existing infrastructure. These schemes have been evaluated using the prioritisation criteria described earlier and narrowed down to key priority proposals for each park and open space as listed in Table 6. below. As might be expected, smaller green spaces have fewer projects assigned, unless there was a demonstrable need identified in the cooperative parks consultation or seen in available evidence. It is expected that this will be a live guide of priority projects, which is updated as funding becomes available. The aspiration is to deliver as much as possible over the next five years.

**Guidance to Interpreting the Table**

- Projects have been kept relatively broad to enable flexibility and discussion with local groups on detail
- Estimated Cost column is purely indicative and based on the cost of installing or building similar capital improvements in other parks
- **S106 Available** column refers to where S106 funding has and will continue to be matched to projects that meet the requirements. This will be updated as S106 funding comes in.
- Other Available column refers to Lambeth capital funding, grant funding, or other funding streams that are made available. As discussed earlier in the plan, the Lambeth capital funding has been allocated to projects that most strongly meet the prioritisation criteria. Where other funding sources have been obtained (e.g. grant funding) this has been listed.
- **Budget Needed** column refers to the outstanding amount that needs to be raised or found externally to deliver the project.
- Funded column depicts the schemes that are able to be financed and delivered at the time of drafting this plan. This will be updated as schemes are completed.
- **Bolded rows** refer to the three highest priority projects for the neighbourhood area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Themed Outcome</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (000)</th>
<th>$106 Available</th>
<th>Other Available</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Riley Gardens</td>
<td>Building Improvements: Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Refurbish depot building</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Provision of outdoor gym/fitness circuit</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve sports and fitness provision, including potential for floodlighting</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Clapham Park Master Plan: £150</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common</td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Redevelopment of changing facilities and toilets</td>
<td>£1,000(^{13})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Infrastructure and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Restoration of historic infrastructure and improved landscaping and biodiversity</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved and modernised children’s play provision</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£213(^{14})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Leno Gardens</td>
<td>Redesign and Landscaping</td>
<td>Re-landscape and redesign space to support community garden</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved and modernised play area</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansdowne Gardens</td>
<td>Soft Landscaping</td>
<td>Horticulture improvements to support residents taking on management</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall Park</td>
<td>Horticulture and Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved bedding, furniture and landscaping</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Improved sports and fitness provision</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£27.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£72.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improve the quality of the play area, including expansion of over 5’s play area</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myatt’s Field Park</td>
<td>Building Improvements; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Convert building depot to support wider use and community management</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernised and extended café and catering facilities</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biodiversity and Heritage</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Installation of a MUGA (or other sports facility) that meets local need and demand</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£45.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of horticultural and planting areas, including amenity space</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) Will explore potential to secure large scale external sporting contribution for this scheme.

\(^{14}\) Consists of 2 $106 community facilities and public realm obligations worth £20,000 and £1,250 respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Budget (£)</th>
<th>Additional Budget (£)</th>
<th>Total Budget (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s Churchyard</td>
<td>Hard Landscaping Improved infrastructure and furniture</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>Horticulture and Hard Landscaping Improved quality of horticulture and pathways, bins, signage, and furniture</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Gardens</td>
<td>Hard Landscaping Improved landscaping, signage, and perimeter fencing</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£3,785</strong></td>
<td><strong>£159.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,690</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list of priority projects are not exhaustive by any means; the proposals more provide an indication of each park’s immediate capital investment needs, which include consideration of issues related to facility improvement needs and park user demographics that may significantly impact on park usage. The proposed projects have also been suggested in the context of Lambeth’s Local Plan (draft) Infrastructure Schedule which aims to support future growth.

However before we start, we also need to emphasise the importance of considering the ongoing revenue costs of individual projects going forward, particularly now, in this financial climate. We have committed to only investing capital monies in schemes that either already have revenue budgets attached or have an associated plan for generating income that can be used to cover the ongoing maintenance costs. Such approaches will include reviewing the opportunities for competitive tender packages (e.g. sports facilities) that factor in clear maintenance expectations.

The top three projects across parks in the Clapham and Stockwell region (in bold in Table above) that are assessed to be of highest priority are also provided in further detail below:
Proposed Project Details:
Construction of changing facilities on Clapham Common

Description:
New, fit-for-purpose sports changing facilities that align with and meet the current and future needs of local sports clubs and groups as laid out in the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy.

Justification:
Clapham Common is a highly used site that contains a host of sports facilities and groups playing regularly on site. Constant issues raised are in relation to the lack of changing facilities to support existing levels of use. Construction of changing facilities would support increased use and create an enhanced competitive sports management offer, which may help generate a more substantial revenue stream. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Cooperative parks consultation found local support behind this scheme – particularly from local sports clubs as a means of encouraging regular use of the sports facilities; initial designs have also been prepared that begin to scope options for the works.
- As the project will lead to more commercial use of the sports facilities by sports clubs, it will present a better competitive tender package for potential operators; resulting in higher revenue generation potential for the Common
- Encouraging higher levels of sports and physical activity is a priority for the borough given its obvious links to health and wellbeing. Parks are the home of grassroots participation in sport and providing changing rooms will help meet local demand and attract new users.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1,000,000 for design and construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£1,000,000 from council investment and other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
This cost is based on Sport England guidelines related to preferred size of facility, which would put Lambeth in good position to bid for external funds.

There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with changing rooms (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). It is expected that as part of the new service model for our parks, we will include these changing rooms and some nearby sports facilities as part of a broader sports management package that includes cover of the ongoing maintenance costs. It is likely that this will also include an expectation that a portion of the income generated is reinvested back in to park operations and services, given the pressures on revenue budgets. This operator package should consider grounds maintenance and programmed and reactive maintenance at a minimum, and discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the new building.
Proposed Project Details:
Refurbishment of depot building in Agnes Riley Gardens

Description:
Agnes Riley is a well used local park with a range of facilities, including a depot building which has over time fallen into disrepair and is rarely used. With substantial refurbishment, this building could better support sports activities opposite and create a new revenue stream for reinvestment back into the park.

Justification:
The central location of the building within the park provides a real opportunity to provide activities and services that complement the park, contributing to positive opportunities for community cohesion. The Friends have started exploring possible uses for a new building, including linking to the sports facility, space for youth activities, and café provision. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Agnes Riley Gardens is also located next to the new Clapham Park development which will result in significant increase in population density in the area, meaning facilities to cater for demand are needed
- Potential for new scheme to open up new sources of revenue for the park with plans to bring an unused building back into action and use it as a means of managing and increasing sports bookings and provide space for local activities or services
- Recent consultation on the draft capital plan demonstrated strong support for this scheme in terms of the need to bring the building back into regular use and integrate it with the park

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£250,000 for design and construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£250,000 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with the building (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). The new management model for our parks looks to ring fence the income generated from parks and reinvest it back in to park operations and services. With this in mind, it is expected that the income generated from use of this refurbished and functional building will be recycled both back into the ongoing building expenditure as well as into Agnes Riley’s operational activities, given the pressures on revenue budgets. This revenue plan should be included in the overall capital development plans for this project and should cover programmed and reactive maintenance at a minimum. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the new building.
Proposed Project Details:
Conversion of Myatt’s Field building depot to support wider use

Description:
The building depot in Myatt’s Field is currently serving as a storage area. With conversion this could be a functional space that contributes financially to the park and broadens the activities on offer.

Justification:
Myatt’s Park is a renowned centre for community food growing and in line with its popularity, needs to expand its offer and diversify to better meet local needs. This is to be achieved by converting the building depot to create a space for further growth and income potential; of increasing importance in light of budget constraints and given this park is one of our parks pioneers. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Proposed scheme will support the park’s plans for a new management structure; start to open up new sources of income through its plans to expand its already popular food growing operation and provide further services
- Myatt’s is located in an area of severe deprivation and given that outcomes tend to be worse than for people living in less deprived areas, building on and expanding what is already a positive facility that reaches out to all sections of the community is prioritised
- In recent years there has been an upsurge in growing your own food, which in many cases has come in the form of community food growing areas. This proposal seeks to expand upon their greenhouse operation, which given its existing levels of popularity, will have a knock on effect in terms of local people achieving health and wellbeing benefits from the fresh food they grow or produce.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£250,000 for construction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£250,000 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with the building (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). The new management model for our parks looks to ring fence the income generated from parks and reinvest it back in to park operations and services. With this in mind, it is expected that the income generated from this building conversion will be held by the pioneer group and recycled both back into the ongoing building expenditure as well as into Myatt’s Park’s operational activities, given the pressures on revenue budgets. This revenue plan should be included in the overall capital development plans for this project and should cover programmed and reactive maintenance at a minimum. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the new building.
Streatham

Streatham Hill, St. Leonards, Streatham Wells and Streatham South Wards

Area Profile
From mid 18th to 19th century, houses and developments were established in Streatham (or ‘hamlet on the street’) and during the inter-war period, Streatham became known as the ‘west-end of south London’ and was a focus of entertainment and subsequently a popular shopping centre. This development also led to the planned development of high-rise residential blocks on Streatham High Street in the 1930s. Following the Second World War, Streatham had the longest and busiest shopping street in south London.

Streatham is now a mixed residential area with around 57,000 residents and is identified in the London Plan as one of the 35 major centres. Recent population growth has increased the diversity of the area with a large Somali community in Streatham South and a Polish community in Streatham Vale. Streatham is home to the largest concentration of Asian residents in the borough and it is relatively affluent compared with other areas of the borough; population density and deprivation are both lower than average. 

Snapshot of Local Parks
Streatham contains many leafy residential areas. There are scattered pockets of open space, such as Streatham Common, Hillside Gardens, and Streatham Vale Park and several nature conservation spaces, which are valuable resources and habitats worth preserving in inner London. For example, Palace Road Nature Garden and Eardley Road Sidings are both areas that require certain forms of ongoing management to ensure they are maintained as areas of sanctuary, wildlife, and biodiversity.

Streatham has received investment in recent years through the Mayor’s Outer London Fund, an initiative intended to revitalize high streets in the outer areas of London. However investment in local parks has been less consistent. For example, through the cooperative parks consultation, a very strong theme emerged in relation to capital investment, namely the historic lack of investment in open spaces in the south of the borough. This is evidenced by results which found that residents in the south of the borough were least likely to be satisfied with physical improvements in their local park or open space, with Streatham Common presenting the highest number of dissatisfied users. It is accepted that this is largely due to the restrictions associated with section 106 and its allocations being bound to the proximity to the development.

Full list of parks and open spaces in the area include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Open Space</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Park Plans</th>
<th>Green Flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Common</td>
<td>Streatham South</td>
<td>• Vision Document</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Woodland Ecological Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Gardens</td>
<td>Streatham Hill</td>
<td>• Masterplan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where do we want to be in ten years?

A number of themes have been pulled out as relevant for the Streatham area. These themes are based on future needs and wrapped around longer-term planning information, including demographic trends, and available research exploring the contribution various capital improvements can make to local outcomes and the associated impact on quality of life.

By setting overarching themes by area, we have attempted to capture and present a strategic view of the future investment needs for local parks in the Streatham region, and use this information as the basis for where we should be harnessing and driving our resources towards over the next five - ten years.

I. Improvements to buildings and related assets in parks

Area bound restrictions in relation to major developments have led to significant differences in funding distribution across the borough. This has meant that areas of Lambeth that have attracted little development, such as the south of the borough have not seen as much investment or improvements, which has resulted in local park facilities falling into disrepair. The Streatham Common playground is one such example where the play area complex, which includes a run-down and unused building, is dilapidated and in need of urgent replacement. This was also supported by the cooperative parks consultation where there were more comments and requests for improved play facilities expressed than seen at any other park.

Notwithstanding the recognised benefits of converting unused buildings or features into functional spaces are the financial benefits that can be realised through a well considered transformation.

Looking ahead, we can see that the landscape for public service delivery is changing as local authority budgets inevitably reduce in line with reductions in overall public sector expenditure. This has meant that we can not continue funding our parks services in the same way. The cooperative parks programme is our response; it aims to support local decision-making or community-managed parks as a means of ensuring that available monies are spent more effectively and to help sustain provision against a backdrop of depleting financial resources. However, to realistically support devolution to local communities, we need to explore alternative income generation models that allow new sources of revenue to be reinvested into the park. This is where the reimagining of our park buildings and assets and their future usage can have a valuable impact.
There has been significant interest in the cooperative model of management from parks in the Streatham cluster, with a particular enthusiasm and interest from cooperative parks pioneers in Streatham Common and the Rookery, and Hillside Gardens, who are proposing to lead the formation of a potential cluster of smaller local parks. Within our parks there are a host of assets which, with some innovative thought, could provide a new revenue stream for our pioneers to help fund necessary maintenance and improvements. The cooperative parks consultation reinforced this point with a number of Streatham Common and Rookery users highlighting the need for improved café facilities in the park, as well as improved community meeting rooms as a means of raising income.

Finally, we know that improvements to park buildings and assets will enhance the reputation of the borough and preserve unique characteristics of its open spaces, which alone is worth future attention.

II. Improved sports and fitness provision

From the Cooperative Parks Consultation, sports facilities were chosen by almost a quarter of respondents, and was the most popular option (joint with facilities for children) in the face to face survey (24%) and the second most popular option in the short questionnaire. This finding is met by a growing understanding that as a borough, Lambeth does not have the number and range of sport and physical activity facilities to meet rising demand. In the south of the borough, there is also a need to understand who the local sports clubs are that are seeking facilities. As seen in the area based needs assessment, facilities are of varying quality and in many cases may need to be upgraded to support increased use. Similar to the building improvements, investment in sports and fitness provision will have dual benefits; improved physical and mental health as well as the possibility of bringing further sources of revenue into the park, which can in turn be reinvested back into service provision.

The emerging Sports and Physical Activity Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy will help us understand where these gaps in sporting provision lie and will ultimately inform the sports development arm of this Plan; however it is also worth including here to ensure it remains a key guiding principle for the future, given the potential growth of sporting activity in the Streatham region and the local spaces available that would suit an increased offer. Improvements to sports and fitness provision in parks and open spaces can also provide an excellent social return on investment by influencing a range of outcomes including:

- Health: increased levels of local physical activity participation have a positive relationship with improved health outcomes and as such represents a very cost-effective means of promoting health and wellbeing
- Local Decision-Making: provision of an additional revenue stream for reinvestment into park and support future running costs, which will be of particular value for cooperative parks pioneers
- Youth Development: providing positive opportunities to divert young people from anti-social behaviour with access to fit-for-purpose sporting infrastructure
- Social Cohesion: parks and open spaces are known to promote community cohesion and sport activities played both formally or informally offer opportunities for this social inclusion to take place.
III. Enhanced biodiversity and ecological habitat development

Lambeth as a whole, has little in the way of ecological areas and natural greenspace, with the main concentration in the centre and south of the borough. Streatham in particular, is fortunate to benefit from several areas of biodiversity in their local green environment, which makes them particularly valuable to the surrounding population and the wealth of wildlife they support. The assumption is that by supporting ecological status of conservation parks and increasing local access, we can create a sense of environmental responsibility and interest in wildlife and nature conservation.

Protecting and enhancing biodiversity also lends itself to attracting volunteers and local schools’ as a tangible and visible means of learning and helping preserve our valuable natural habitats for all forms of wildlife. Looking to the future, this would prove helpful for budding cooperative parks pioneers as a way of encouraging good practice whilst keeping associated maintenance costs down. Proposed investment under this theme specifically refers to sustaining ecosystems which develop around a local natural habitat, which in urban parks are invariably woodlands, ponds, allotments, and other environs that support a rich variety of life. Additional recommendations have revolved around drainage, soil, and grass improvements, which would again help reduce ongoing maintenance costs and long-term reliance on Council funding.

The recognised relationship between green environments and enhanced mental wellbeing serves to illustrate their value. Attention to increasing ecological value and enhanced green networks that support the interdependency of species in future would also make major contributions to biodiversity conservation objectives. Parks and open spaces also have an important role to play in furthering the sustainability agenda. Given the number of green spaces in the Streatham area, there are some small interventions that can make a difference to the local environment, largely in terms of improving air quality in an urban environment and exploring the role green spaces can play in waste management. We know that plant life and trees help reduce pollutants in the air and there are also natural biological systems for waste (e.g. mulching with locally produced woodchip and compost) that can make an urban environment more self-sustaining.

**How do we start?**

Across our stock of parks and open spaces there are a range of capital improvement schemes underway or in the pipeline, which contribute to improving the quality and accessibility of our parks and open spaces. These projects are often developed and delivered as part of either section 106 funding or larger Lottery applications and shaped in partnership with local communities. Table 7 presents these live capital schemes:

**Table 7: Capital Projects in the Pipeline in the Streatham Neighbourhood**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Indicative Cost (000)</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palace Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Public art project to repaint the mural on the adjacent wall</td>
<td>£10.8</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, alongside these developments are the host of capital improvement schemes that are currently unfunded and which based on local evidence, park user feedback and existing park master plans, are of urgent need to improve local outcomes and help support the delivery of the cooperative parks programme. We can see from the area-based needs assessment that the quality of parks and open spaces vary considerably in Streatham. It is also clear from the strong and consistent messaging in the cooperative parks consultation that dedicated attention towards significantly improving park facilities is needed to address the historic lack of investment (largely driven from funding restrictions) and the deep-seated community need. Potential schemes have been evaluated using the prioritisation criteria described earlier and narrowed down to key priority proposals for each park and open space as listed in Table 8. below. As might be expected, smaller green spaces have fewer projects assigned, unless there was a demonstrable need identified in the cooperative parks consultation or seen in available evidence. It is expected that this will be a live guide of priority projects, which is updated as funding becomes available. The aspiration is to deliver as much as possible over the next five years.

Guidance to Interpreting the Table

- Projects have been kept relatively broad to enable flexibility and discussion with local groups on detail
- Estimated Cost column is purely indicative and based on the cost of installing or building similar capital improvements in other parks
- S106 Available column refers to where S106 funding has and will continue to be matched to projects that meet the requirements. This will be updated as S106 funding comes in.
- Other Available column refers to Lambeth capital funding, grant funding, or other funding streams that are made available. As discussed earlier in the plan, the Lambeth capital funding has been allocated to projects that most strongly meet the prioritisation criteria. Where other funding sources have been obtained (e.g. grant funding) this has been listed.
- Budget Needed column refers to the outstanding amount that needs to be raised or found externally to deliver the project.
- Funded column depicts the schemes that are able to be financed and delivered at the time of drafting this plan. This will be updated as schemes are completed.
- Bolded rows refer to the three highest priority projects for the neighbourhood area.

Table 8: Streatham Region Projects to be Delivered from 2014/15 – 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Themed Outcome</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (000)</th>
<th>Budget (000)</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eardley Road Sidings</td>
<td>Enhanced Biodiversity</td>
<td>Improved public access and prevent or reduce flood damage on site</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Gardens</td>
<td>Building Improvements; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Conversion of public toilet block</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£21.7</td>
<td>£578.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve sporting provision to support increased use</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>£43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved entrances to park</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget (GBP)</th>
<th>Subsidy (GBP)</th>
<th>Development Value (GBP)</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kirkstall Gardens</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Improved Horticulture and planting with focus on community orchards</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace Road Nature Garden</td>
<td>Environmental Education</td>
<td>Develop space as educational environment facility, including information boards and a pond dipping platform</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Avenue</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Visually attractive horticulture and planting</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport Playing Fields</td>
<td>Improve Provision and Quality</td>
<td>Major drainage works to alleviate flooding to fields and nearby property</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Common</td>
<td>Enhanced Children’s Play; Building Improvements; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Regenerate play area and adjacent building</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£58.316</td>
<td>£941.7</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping and Access</td>
<td>Improved landscaping around the park to support larger events</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Improved sports and physical activity facilities</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Green</td>
<td>Improved Access and Condition</td>
<td>Regeneration of park, including improved entrances, access, and furniture</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>Hard Landscaping and Access</td>
<td>Upgraded park furniture and access, including paths, benches, and possible planting (rose beds)</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Rookery</td>
<td>Improved Infrastructure Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Explore alternative uses of Rookery, to support outdoor theatre and events, including fittings or pergola</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Landscaping</td>
<td>Improved pathways, furniture, and perimeter fencing</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Improvements; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Regeneration of yard area to include community/hire space</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Vale Park</td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Improved sports facilities</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play Refurbishment</td>
<td>Improved children’s play area</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unigate Woods</td>
<td>Access and Landscaping</td>
<td>General access and landscaping improvements, including providing gravel footpaths and better signage</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Consists of a combination of 3 S106 public realm and children and young peoples play agreements in the local area worth £8,682, £19,328, and £30,280.
### Enhanced Biodiversity

Enhance grassland habitat and encourage new growth and diverse species

£50 | £50<sup>17</sup> | - | £0 | Yes

### Valley Road Playing Fields

**Sports and Fitness Provision**

Improved playing pitch condition, including exploring changing room provision

£200 | £44.4<sup>18</sup> | - | £155.6

**Improved Access**

Improved entrances and perimeter fencing

£200 | - | - | £200

**Total**

£4,100 | £231.4 | £1,770 | £2,098.6

This list of priority projects are not exhaustive by any means; the proposals more provide an indication of each park’s immediate capital investment needs, which include consideration of issues related to previous investment, generating additional revenue, and improving quality of park provision with a view to significantly increasing park usage. The proposed projects have also been suggested in the context of Lambeth’s Local Plan (draft) Infrastructure Schedule which aims to support future growth.

However before we start, we also need to emphasise the importance of considering the ongoing revenue costs of individual projects going forward, particularly now, in this financial climate. We have committed to only investing capital monies in schemes that either already have revenue budgets attached or have an associated plan for generating income that can be used to cover the ongoing maintenance costs. Such approaches will include reviewing the opportunities for competitive tender packages (e.g. sports facilities) that factor in clear maintenance expectations.

The top three projects across parks in the Streatham region (bolded in Table above) that are assessed to be of highest priority are also provided in further detail below:

---

<sup>17</sup> Unigate Woods improvements are funded through the same S106 agreement, worth £100.7 in total.

<sup>18</sup> Consists of two S106 sports and leisure site specific contributions worth £4,141 and £40,260 respectively.
**Proposed Project Details:**

Renovation of the play area and adjacent building in Streatham Common

**Description:**

Provision of accessible, modernised play area to replace the existing run-down playground as well as the conversion of the existing derelict building into a café and changing room to support both increased income generation and increased usage of sports facilities.

**Justification:**

Proposed scheme will help generate a significant revenue stream for the Common (including sports pitch bookings), which as one of our pioneer parks is of importance. Play provision in Streatham Common was also the most requested capital scheme improvement and coupled with historic lack of capital investment explains its high priority position. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- The new development will not only bring a dilapidate and highly visible building back into regular use, but will support the park’s plans for a new management structure; start to funnel new income streams into the park through its plans to provide café provision and hire space for activity sessions (e.g. Pilates classes) or local groups
- Streatham Common has received very little investment in the past and its facilities have consequently slowly fallen into disrepair; in particular the play area. This project starts to redress this underinvestment and will lead to a significantly higher number of visitors to the Common
- Both the cooperative parks consultation and the recent period of consultation on the draft plan seeded the highest levels of local support for this scheme. In fact, local users have already mobilised around this project and held consultation events and commissioned draft design options.

**Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| £1,000,000 for design and construction | £58,290 in three S106 contributions:  
- Two general park improvements in local vicinity  
- One children and young peoples play space | £941,700 from council investment and potentially other contributions |

**Revenue Costs:**

It is expected that all play facilities that are designed and built will have a low maintenance specification attached (e.g. no sand or water based activity and low maintenance horticulture) that seeks to minimise ongoing revenue costs, given its newer condition. There will also be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with the refurbished building (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). The new management model for our parks looks to ring fence the income generated from parks and reinvest it back in to park operations and services. With this in mind, it is expected that the capital development plan build in expectations around reinvesting the income generated to cover the programmed safety inspections (e.g. ROPSA) and any minor repairs to equipment, given the pressures on revenue budgets.
Proposed Project Details:
Conversion and expansion of public toilet block in Hillside Gardens

Description:
Conversion of public toilet block to provide community facilities to support community use/hire and encourage complementary activity in the park that links to the community garden and provides a space for alternative physical activity sessions

Justification:
The building is in a poor condition and requires investment to bring it up to a standard that is fit for purpose and contributes to the park’s overall offer. Situated near to the existing tennis courts and community garden, facilities could provide further revenue that contributed towards ongoing running costs of the park; supporting this pioneer park’s future management ambitions. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Scheme will support a more sustainable management structure; start to funnel new income streams into the park through its plans to provide community hire space for activity sessions (e.g. Pilates classes) or as a hired educational space for local schools
- Represents value for money as it will help build engagement in the park by local schools given the planned link to education. It will also bring a dilapidated and currently unused building back into regular use
- Creating a space for learning about nature can not only help broaden children’s education; but the hands-on nature of the work is recognised to have an important effect on health and wellbeing.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£600,000 for refurbishment</td>
<td>£21,753 in S106 general park improvements in local area</td>
<td>£578,240 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with the refurbished building (e.g. utilities, building compliance, repairs, etc). The new management model for our parks looks to ring fence the income generated from parks and reinvest it back in to park operations and services. With this in mind, it is expected that the capital development plan build a plan for meeting the ongoing revenue costs whether by reinvesting the income generated to cover planned and reactive building costs or by recycling income generated from other areas of the park (e.g. tennis courts); given the pressures on revenue budgets. This recycling and sharing of the income can be carried out by the pioneer group. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the new building.
Proposed Project Details:
Regeneration of Streatham Green

Description:
Streatham Green is a central town centre space that regularly hosts markets and local events. Substantial investment is needed to regenerate and redesign this space to improve its overall quality and value and facilitate it making a greater contribution to the local area.

Justification:
By regenerating this green space and involving local communities in its redesign, we will be fostering a sense of local ownership with long-term benefits of building the capacity of the local community and community cohesion. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- This local space is already a hub where local residents come together; building community cohesion. This proposal will improve a central space and continue to ensure residents have the opportunity to get some fresh air and enjoy surroundings that are more attractive; subsequently having a positive effect on health and wellbeing.
- The contribution and added value regeneration of green space can have on a local area is well established and this scheme will ensure this open space contributes to this urban area; enhancing the reputation and feel of the local area.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£250,000 for regeneration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£250,000 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
It is expected that that the area designs and landscaping will have a low maintenance specification attached (e.g. no water features and low maintenance horticulture) and look to incorporate more modern designs and infrastructure that lower revenue costs. As a regeneration scheme, there is also an expectation that sustainable planning principles will be bedded in. In addition, there should either be an associated revenue budget attached or a plan for income generated from other activities or services in the park to be used to cover ongoing costs (e.g. income from stalls or small events using the space).
Norwood

Thurlow Park, Knight’s Hill, and Gipsy Hill Wards

Area Profile
During the 19th Century common land in Lambeth was enclosed and the woodland north of Croydon became the suburb Norwood. Norwood is a mainly residential area with around 42,000 residents and contains Lambeth’s only remaining industrial area. As an area, Norwood does not have the wide ranges of income and deprivation found in other areas of Lambeth and is well known for its high quality of life and popular town centre in West Norwood. Norwood’s arts attractions are popular with locals and visitors alike and its cemetery is an increasingly popular attraction which draws people in from all over.

Snapshot of Local Parks
Similar to Streatham, Norwood has also benefitted from recent investment from the Mayor’s Outer London Fund dedicated to help revitalise the area. Norwood also benefits from different parks and open spaces, including the conservation area Knight’s Hill Wood, through to the churchyard in St. Luke’s Church Gardens. West Norwood Feast is a local community initiative held on a monthly basis, aimed at drawing visitors to the area and comprises of fresh produce and retro markets.

Norwood Park is the biggest park in the area and is well renowned for its spectacular panoramic views over south London and range of play and sports facilities as well as wildflower areas. West Norwood Cemetery is known for its historical, landscape, and architectural importance. Rosendale Playing Fields is another important resource that caters for different sports activities and is regularly used by local schools and leased to the Council.

Full list of parks and open spaces in the area include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Open Space</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Park Plans</th>
<th>Green Flag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td>Gipsy Hill</td>
<td>Management Plan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tivoli Park</td>
<td>Knights Hill</td>
<td>Masterplan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosendale Playing Fields</td>
<td>Thurlow Park</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lukes Church Gardens</td>
<td>Knights Hill</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becondale Road Open Space</td>
<td>Gipsy Hill</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight’s Hill Wood</td>
<td>Knights Hill</td>
<td>Ecological Management Plan</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where do we want to be in ten years?
A number of themes have been pulled out as relevant for the Norwood area. These themes are based on future needs and wrapped around longer-term planning information, including demographic trends, and available research exploring the contribution various capital improvements can make to local outcomes and the associated impact on quality of life.

By setting overarching themes by area, we have attempted to capture and present a strategic view of the future investment needs for local parks and open spaces in the Norwood region, and use this information as the basis for where we should be harnessing and driving our resources towards over the next five - ten years.
I. Improved sports and fitness provision

From the Cooperative Parks Consultation, sports facilities were chosen by almost a quarter of respondents, and was the most popular option (joint with facilities for children) in the face to face survey (24%) and the second most popular option in the short questionnaire. This finding is met by a growing understanding that as a borough, Lambeth does not have the number and range of sport and physical activity facilities to meet rising demand. In the south of the borough, there is also a need to understand who the local sports clubs are that are seeking facilities. As seen in the area based needs assessment, facilities are of varying quality and in many cases may need to be upgraded to support increased use. Similar to the building improvements, investment in sports and fitness provision will have dual benefits; improved physical and mental health as well as the possibility of bringing further revenue into the park, which can in turn be reinvested back into service provision.

The emerging Sports and Physical Activity Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy will help us understand where these gaps in sporting provision lie and will ultimately inform the sports development arm of this Plan; however it is also worth including here to ensure it remains a key guiding principle for the future, given the potential growth of sporting activity in the Norwood region and the local spaces available that would suit an increased offer. Improvements to sports and fitness provision in parks and open spaces can also provide an excellent social return on investment by influencing a range of outcomes including:

- Health: increased levels of local physical activity participation have a positive relationship with improved health outcomes and as such represents a very cost-effective means of promoting health and wellbeing
- Local Decision-Making: provision of an additional revenue stream for reinvestment into park and support future running costs, which will be of particular value for parks pioneers
- Youth Development: providing positive opportunities to divert young people from anti-social behaviour with access to fit-for-purpose sporting infrastructure
- Social Cohesion: parks are known to promote community cohesion and sport activities played both formally or informally offer opportunities for this social inclusion to take place.

We can see that West Norwood in particular, is starting to become a focus for sports and physical activity provision with the recent leisure centre that has been built and highly popular outdoor gym in Norwood Park. This theme aims to capitalise on this growing need for further sporting provision.

II. Improved play facilities that meet a variety of local needs

Parks provide an important role in serving the community including providing children’s play opportunities for different age groups and facilitating a connection with the natural environment. It is widely acknowledged that children’s play contributes towards child development and the development of a wide range of physical, social, and emotional skills and abilities and as parks are often the settings for play, there is a need to ensure the available facilities are fit for purpose and provide for different types of play experiences. This finding was reinforced by the cooperative parks consultation that identified children’s play areas as the greatest need by the most respondents.

We know that children need to be able to access play provision closer to their home. It is often difficult for children to travel long distances to use play areas. In the Norwood neighbourhood
region, there are fewer parks and open spaces, which lends itself to a greater focus on the form of
dedicated children’s play and social interaction that is currently available to meet local needs.
Stakeholder engagement in the Open Space Strategy (2013) found that although play space
provision was generally adequate for certain groups (e.g. young children), it was not inclusive for all
and a greater variety of play facilities was needed to cater for all groups. A strong link was also seen
between poor quality play facilities and open spaces that were suffering from vandalism.

How do we start?
Across our stock of parks and open spaces there are a range of capital improvement schemes
underway or in the pipeline, which contribute to improving the quality and accessibility of our parks
and open spaces. These projects are often developed and delivered as part of either section 106
funding or larger Lottery applications and shaped in partnership with local communities. Table 9
presents these live capital schemes:

Table 9: Capital Projects in the Pipeline in the Norwood Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Indicative Cost (000)</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td>Improved biodiversity, including pond improvement works and provision of a wildflower meadow</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, alongside these developments are the host of capital improvement schemes that are
currently unfunded and which based on local evidence, park user feedback and existing park master
plans, are of urgent need to improve local outcomes and help support the delivery of the
cooperative parks programme. We can see from the area-based needs assessment that the quality
and nature of parks and open spaces vary considerably in Norwood. There are also fewer green
spaces, emphasising the need to ensure those available are of a high quality. Potential schemes
have been evaluated using the prioritisation criteria described earlier and narrowed down to key
priority proposals for each park and open space as listed in Table 10. below. As might be expected,
smaller green spaces have fewer projects assigned, unless there was a demonstrable need identified
in the cooperative parks consultation or seen in available evidence. It is expected that this will be a
live guide of priority projects, which is updated as funding becomes available. The aspiration is to
deliver as much as possible over the next five years.

Guidance to Interpreting the Table

- Projects have been kept relatively broad to enable flexibility and discussion with local groups on detail
- Estimated Cost column is purely indicative and based on the cost of installing or building similar capital
  improvements in other parks
- S106 Available column refers to where S106 funding has and will continue to be matched to projects that meet
  the requirements. This will be updated as S106 funding comes in.
- Other Available column refers to Lambeth capital funding, grant funding, or other funding streams that are
  made available. As discussed earlier in the plan, the Lambeth capital funding has been allocated to projects that
  most strongly meet the prioritisation criteria. Where other funding sources have been obtained (e.g. grant
  funding) this has been listed.
- Budget Needed column refers to the outstanding amount that needs to be raised or found externally to deliver
  the project.
- Funded column depicts the schemes that are able to be financed and delivered at the time of drafting this plan.
  This will be updated as schemes are completed.
- Bolded rows refer to the three highest priority projects for the neighbourhood area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Themed Outcome</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (£000)</th>
<th>Budget (£000) Available</th>
<th>Other Available</th>
<th>Budget (£000) Needed</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becondale Road Open Space</td>
<td>Enriched Horticulture</td>
<td>Focus on horticulture and planting schemes to improve attractiveness</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights Hill Wood</td>
<td>Improved Hardstanding and Access</td>
<td>Improve fencing, paths, and entrances</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Upgrading sports and fitness facilities</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improvements to children’s play area, particularly wet play</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Improvements: Revenue</td>
<td>Explore café improvements, including seating provision</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosendale Playing Fields</td>
<td>Access and Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Replace perimeter fencing around site, including secure gates</td>
<td>£40</td>
<td>£20.4</td>
<td>£19.6</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Fitness Provision</td>
<td>Upgrade/resurface hard courts with synthetic pitch</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Church Gardens</td>
<td>Improved Hardstanding</td>
<td>Improvements to Church surrounds, railings, and access roads</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tivoli Park</td>
<td>Children’s Play</td>
<td>Improved and more varied play facilities for children</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Access</td>
<td>Rebuilding boundary retaining walls, drainage improvements (including flood management), and access</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£1,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>£20.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>£319.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>£875</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list of priority projects are not exhaustive by any means; the proposals more provide an indication of each park’s immediate capital investment needs, which include consideration of issues related to previous investment, generating additional revenue, and improving quality of park provision with a view to significantly increasing park usage. The proposed projects have also been suggested in the context of Lambeth’s Local Plan (draft) Infrastructure Schedule which aims to support future growth.

However before we start, we also need to emphasise the importance of considering the ongoing revenue costs of individual projects going forward, particularly now, in this financial climate. We have committed to only investing capital monies in schemes that either already have revenue budgets attached or have an associated plan for generating income that can be used to cover the ongoing maintenance costs. Such approaches will include reviewing the opportunities for competitive tender packages (e.g. sports facilities) that factor in clear maintenance expectations.
The top three projects across parks in the Norwood region (bolded in Table above) that are assessed to be of highest priority are also provided in further detail below:

### Proposed Project Details:
Replacement of perimeter fencing in Rosendale Playing Fields

#### Description:
The Fields are currently owned by Dulwich Estate and leased to Lambeth Council at a rate of £18k per annum until 2026 (although this figure is incrementally increased over time). The fencing around the perimeter of the playing fields is in incredibly poor condition and in parts, has collapsed leading to fly tipping and vandalism. There is a need to install secure metal perimeter fencing with access gates to improve and prevent anti-social behaviour and facilitate regular use of the fields.

#### Justification:
Fencing issues pose a rising health and safety and security threat to users of the facility as well as creating an associated revenue cost related to graffiti, dog litter, and repairs. Assuming the fencing is replaced, the Rosendale Community Interest Company (a parks pioneer) is interested in potential reassignment of the lease with a view to taking on independent management of this site. This will lead to more regular use of these fields by local schools and sports groups, which will increase revenue potential. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- The condition of the fences is such that the entire site has no security leading to community safety issues and regular fly tipping in the middle of the fields. Not only is this an additional revenue burden on the council, but it is deteriorating a valued site for local schools.
- With proposed investment, the site would be much more secure, protecting the facilities and allowing for stored equipment. This would support a more commercial operation for sports clubs and groups and a more regular revenue stream, leading to an eventual reassignment of the lease.
- Playing fields are valued local resources, particularly for schools, and encourage higher levels of sports and physical activity, which is a priority for the borough given its obvious links to health and wellbeing. Better use of these fields will support grassroots participation in sport and help meet local demand.

#### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£20,393 of a S106 public realm obligation in the local area</td>
<td>£19,607 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Revenue Costs:
It is expected that the installation of metal as opposed to wooden fences will have a lower maintenance cost attached. There will nevertheless need to be consideration of meeting any unplanned reactive repair costs. It is assumed that once new fences are provided, the site will start generating income through sports court hire, which can then be recycled back into the fields to meet these ongoing costs. In time, the case should be made to reassign the lease for this site (pending landlord agreement), which will save the council money in ongoing lease payments.
Proposed Project Details:
Upgrade sporting facility provision in Norwood Park

Description:
Norwood Park currently has a hard surface multi-use games area that is not fit for purpose for the majority of sporting activities. Project proposes to upgrade and modernise facility to support greater and more varied sports activity.

Justification:
The emerging Playing Pitch Strategy demonstrates a need for at least nine artificial turf pitches to meet local demand. By improving the existing facility, we will be supporting increased physical activity as well as ensuring there is a good distribution of high quality sports facilities across the borough. There is also local support for improvements, which has included schools in the area. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- Providing further sports provision and linking to local schools in the area contributes to our public health outcomes by encouraging higher levels of sports and physical activity; a priority for the borough. Creating a more fit for purpose facility will support grassroots participation in sport and help meet local demand.
- The sports pitch is located in an area of severe deprivation and given that outcomes tend to be worse than for people living in less deprived areas, providing a positive facility that reaches out to all sections of the community is prioritised
- Potential for scheme to open up new sources of revenue with plans to encourage more frequent use of the pitch with a view to supporting sustainable management of the park.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£150,000 from council investment and other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
There will be ongoing revenue maintenance costs associated with sports facility provision in terms of both planned and unplanned repairs and maintenance. It is expected that as part of the new service model for our parks, we will include this site in a sports management package that includes cover of the ongoing maintenance costs. It is also possible that this will include an expectation that a portion of the income generated is reinvested back in to park’s operations and services, given the pressures on revenue budgets. This operator package should consider grounds maintenance and programmed and reactive maintenance at a minimum, and discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to the pitch.
Proposed Project Details:
Modernise existing children’s play facilities in Tivoli Park

Description:
Tivoli Park is a well used, local park whose children’s play facilities are in need of modernisation to better support and develop varied play opportunities in the Norwood area.

Justification:
This proposal aims to create more modern play environments within parks that are accessible, of a high quality, and encourage children and young people to use them. Using the existing footprint, we can ensure the natural character of the park is retained. This scheme scored highly against the following prioritisation criteria:

- The role a good playground can play in enhancing children’s’ health and wellbeing is well documented as it offers opportunities for interaction, space, and healthy activity
- More modern play area will enhance the reputation of the borough and will provide an accessible, engaging, and free opportunity for children to be outside; building a healthy knowledge of the outside environment.

Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Operational Cost</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
<th>Balance Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£150,000 from council investment and potentially other contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue Costs:
It is expected that all play facilities that are designed and built will have a low maintenance specification attached (e.g. no sand or water based activity and low maintenance horticulture). In addition, there should either be an associated revenue budget attached or a plan for income generated from other activities or services in the park to be used to cover ongoing costs. This should cover programmed safety inspections (e.g. ROPSA) and any minor repairs to equipment. Discussions with potential suppliers should include under warranty, any defects or major structural damage to equipment.
Playground Renewal Projects

We know that in addition to delivering new projects, we need to renew our existing stock of assets. This is of particular importance for play areas. Playgrounds have a typical lifespan of 10-15 years and part of this plan involves renewing these areas on a cyclical basis to ensure they remain safe to use and fit for purpose.

Listed below in Table 11 are our play areas in parks and when they were installed. These will need to be considered when this capital plan undergoes its midway review.

Table 11: Playgrounds in Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/s</th>
<th>Playground Condition</th>
<th>Installation Date</th>
<th>Included in Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Riley Gardens</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishops Park</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockwell Park</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common – Windmill Drive</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common - Westside</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam Street</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Square</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Gardens</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmewood Gardens</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington Park</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth High Street Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkhall Park – Priory Court</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough Park</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Roach Park</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkwood Road</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostyn Gardens</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myatt’s Field Park</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedlar’s Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Common</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Park</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slade Gardens</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marks Churchyard</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Matthews Churchyard</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Common</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Vale Park</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tivoli Park</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufford Street Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Park</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Gardens</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyck Gardens</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Borough-Wide Priority Projects

Despite the fact that an important case can be made for investing in individual parks or open spaces, there is a clear need to consider projects that are of strategic significance to the borough. In the past this has included the regeneration of Brockwell Park which has benefitted from large scale investment from the Heritage Lottery Fund and is now home to both the Lambeth Country Show and the Lambeth Fireworks; as well as Myatt’s Field Park, a another HLF recipient that has now become one of the borough’s most popular and regularly visited parks.

As a council, we recognise that what is now needed is a clear plan of action to help potential funders that are interested in these borough-wide projects focus their investment. Essentially, a capital programme that articulates what type of investment in our parks would make the most impact for our residents. In responding to this need, we have outlined in the broadest sense what capital improvements would add value to local areas and maximise the full spectrum of green spaces that are available for communities to enjoy.

As with the neighbourhood projects, this does not preclude groups from applying for externally funding independently from the council; the list of projects below represent the schemes the council will actively support.

Table 12: Priority Borough-Wide Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/s</th>
<th>Themed Outcome</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockwell Park</td>
<td>Functional Buildings; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Brockwell Hall regeneration</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham Common</td>
<td>Park Architecture and Landscaping</td>
<td>Restoration of historic infrastructure and improved landscaping and biodiversity</td>
<td>£800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Park</td>
<td>Functional Buildings; Pioneer Revenue Support</td>
<td>Restoration of the historic features including the stable block and portico</td>
<td>£850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham Rookery</td>
<td>Park Architecture and Landscaping</td>
<td>Preserving the historic walled garden and improving the hard and soft landscaping</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Park</td>
<td>Park Architecture and Landscaping</td>
<td>Revitalising the horticultural and historic character and design of the park</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens</td>
<td>Park Architecture and Landscaping</td>
<td>Revitalising the space and preserving its historic character</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance to Interpreting the Table

- Projects have been kept relatively broad to enable flexibility and discussion with local groups on detail
- Estimated Cost column is purely indicative and based on the cost of installing or building similar capital improvements in other parks
Delivering this plan in full will cost over £20million. As highlighted, we are committed to investing £9million of Council funds; the most money we have ever invested in our parks and open spaces.

Our initial contribution will help deliver the immediate investment priorities in each neighbourhood, which will include applications to National Governing Bodies of Sports or developer contributions as appropriate (e.g. construction of Clapham Common changing rooms). This funding will also be profiled and used as match funding to support external, community-led bids.

The spend profile to deliver these priority projects for each neighbourhood area is described below in Table 13.

**Table 13: Financial Profile by Neighbourhood**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Project Costs (000)</th>
<th>Committed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth</td>
<td>£550</td>
<td>£160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixton</td>
<td>£1,250</td>
<td>£14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streatham</td>
<td>£1,850</td>
<td>£80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood</td>
<td>£340</td>
<td>£20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>£274.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Needed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£5,215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned, external contributions will be sought to help us reduce the total cost of delivering these high priority projects. There is also a high expectation placed on our communities to help us finance the remaining projects; join us in attracting a substantial amount of external investment. Following feedback received during the consultation phase, we are also proposing to apportion part of our initial investment towards supporting communities plug this gap; namely by providing project delivery support. It is planned that these roles will be funded from external funding contributions within three years.

Hand in hand with our aspiration that our communities work with us to help secure money for capital schemes in parks, is the need to implement a form of ring-fencing of the raised funds to the park, and facility concerned. It is recognised that this is a prerequisite to communities before any new partnerships are taken on. In effect, this approach will help protect local interest and buy-in to individual green spaces.

As described, delivering this plan relies on your help. We will continue to match available S106 that comes in to projects in this plan. And we need your support to fund the rest. To proactively work with the project delivery support officers and raise money either using the new funding streams that have opened up as a result of previous investment or through external grant funders.

Some examples of potential funding sources we need to explore to help us finance this plan include:
• **Heritage Lottery Fund** – using money raised through the National Lottery, the Heritage Lottery Fund gives grants to sustain and transform our heritage through innovative investment in projects with a lasting impact on people and places. Roughly £375 million is available to invest in new projects each year.

• **Big Lottery Fund** – again, money raised from the National Lottery are allocated to good causes and specifically, community groups and projects that improve health, education, and the environment. Agency distributes approximately £600 million each year and 80/90% of funding tends to be awarded to voluntary and community sector organisations. Includes administering funding programmes such as Awards for All (supporting participation in art, sport, heritage and community activities, and projects that promote education, the environment and health in the local community); Parks for People (improving historic spaces), and Reaching Communities: England (funds capital and revenue schemes that help people most in need).

• **Biffa Awards** – this multi-million pound fund awards grants to community and environmental projects across the UK that will be of lasting environmental benefit, increase or maintain biodiversity, improve quality of life, and foster vibrant communities.

• **Community Development Foundation** – national organisation that focuses on community development and engagement, which funds projects that aim to improve local areas

• **London Marathon Charitable Trust** – Trust awards grants to recreational projects primarily in London that support increased sports or physical activity participation.

• **Community/private partnerships** – there is opportunity for commercial or social enterprise organisations to work with the voluntary sector to design and deliver a mutually beneficial capital improvement scheme for use of the general public, which potentially brings in revenue. For example, Veolia have invested in local schemes across a number of Lambeth parks.

• **Sport England** – Sport England allocate funding for both sporting activities and capital facility improvement projects that increase levels of participation. This ranges from improving primary school sports facilities through to bringing playing fields back into use.

• **Esmee Fairburn** - foundation focuses on the cultural life of the UK, including the natural environment and has recently supported allotments and city farms.

• **Age UK** – Age UK offer grants for organisations aiming to make life better for older people and address their needs.

• **National Governing Bodies of Sport** – there are a host of National Governing Bodies of Sport (NGBs) that support over a hundred sports, including providing capital investment to support increasing grassroots community sports development.
• **Charitable Trusts** – charities are another recognised route to accessing funding. For example, the national parks charity GreenSpace was launched to safeguard the future of public green spaces by allowing community groups and philanthropists to give and influence locally. In addition, the Ernest Cook Trust is a leading educational charity that offers grants to not for profit organisations that actively encourage children and young people interest in the countryside, environment, or the arts.

• **Landfill Tax Credit Scheme** – this scheme aims to distribute funds generated from Landfill Tax in the UK as a means of helping mitigate the effects of landfill upon local communities. Western Riverside Environment Fund is one example of an organisation that delivers environmental objectives.

• **Capital Growth** – organisation offers practical help, training and support to people wanting to grow their own food, whether at home, on an allotment or as part of a community group.

• **Trust Organisations** – there are a range of Trusts in the UK that provide grants and funding to communities. For example, Tudor Trust is an independent grant making trust that supports smaller voluntary and community-led groups that are supporting marginalised residents.
Next Steps

Already, this plan has started generating imaginative discussion about what is possible for our valued green spaces and has prompted more people to get involved; reviving local interest in the borough's parks and open spaces. The fact that we have earmarked the largest investment ever made in our parks and open spaces speaks volumes for our commitment to our green spaces and to your local efforts to raise the profile of our parks time and again. Implementation of this capital plan will take place in two stages, which are described below and illustrated in Figure 2.

Stage One: Setting the Scene
Stage one will involve the development of Parks Capital Development Compacts for each neighbourhood which will be used to profile the necessary investment over the next five years. These compacts will not only allow us to plan our annual spend and determine our timelines, but will help us see where there are similar capital projects planned for different parks that we could combine to achieve economies of scale in terms of architects or project management fees.

These neighbourhood compacts will act as local implementation plans that will also review potential funding sources and include plans to apply for external bids through the project delivery process as a means of creating flexibility across the capital programme. We expect these will be prepared in early 2015.

Stage Two: Project Delivery
Stage two refers to the delivery of this capital programme. Delivery of the prioritised projects will be led by the Council, including the preparation of any potential funding applications, with input from local communities. Delivery of the remaining projects will be driven by local communities and groups who will work with the community project delivery support officers to apply for and secure external funding. As depicted in the ‘Your Involvement’ section, at all stages local groups will have the opportunity to get involved and feed into project development and delivery from funding applications and detailed design, to appointment of contractors and contract monitoring. Any appropriate and available S106 contributions will also be used as part of the match funding contribution to pump prime or stimulate these community-driven capital schemes.

Figure 2: Project Delivery Process

- Development of Parks Capital Development Compacts, which will outline:
  - Timeline for delivery of neighbourhood priority schemes
  - Profiled spend over five years, including for the council’s match funding contribution
  - Funding raising targets for external contributions
  - Project delivery (community support) officers are appointed

- Council leads the implementation of high priority projects with local input on scope and design
- Communities drive delivery of remaining projects with Project delivery community support officers
- Profile and implementation plan for any residual funding, including S106 contributions for remaining community projects
Have we got it right?

Already, this plan has generated much discussion about what is needed in our parks and open spaces and how we plan to spend our funding to best meet local needs. Using the information available to us, we have made the best assessment we can; drawing on both consultation feedback and strategic parks plans. However, as with most plans and with the best intentions, we know that we may not have got it entirely right first time.

In recognition of this, we have built in to the plan a system where you can challenge the priorities set for your park and make a case for an alternative scheme that you consider would have a greater and more positive impact.

What to do

All you need to do is send an email entitled ‘Parks Capital Investment Plan Proposal’ to:

cooperativeparks@lambeth.gov.uk

Include a description of your alternative capital project and why you think it will better meet local demand and we will invite you along to a panel discussion to look at your idea in further detail.

Who can apply

We know there is a large call on our capital investment and a great many things we could do improve them for everyone. While we recognise that many groups may wish to discuss individual schemes, given the breadth of parks and open spaces across the borough, we will only look to receive alternative capital improvement proposals from our parks pioneers, working towards level 2 (cooperative management) or level 3 (community-led management).

The profile of the cooperative parks programme is growing every day with local groups starting to build the foundations needed to successfully take on greater roles in their respective park or open space. If this is something you’re interested in, write to the cooperative parks email address above to find out how you can join the movement and become one of our parks pioneers.