

Regeneration Committee – 3 November 2015

Transcript of Agenda Item 5 – Intensification Areas

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Item 5, the main item for business today, is on Intensification Areas (IAs). I would like to welcome our four guests this morning and ask them to introduce themselves, starting at this end with Alex.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, Transport for London): I am Alex Williams, Director of Borough Planning from Transport for London (TfL).

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): I am Stephen Kelly, Assistant Director for Planning at Haringey Council [London Borough of Haringey].

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Good morning. My name is Faraz Baber. I am the Executive Director for Policy at London First, which is the business membership organisation to make London the best city in the world in which to do business.

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, Greater London Authority): I am Darren Richards. I am the Strategic Planning Manager for Opportunity Area [Planning] Frameworks (OAPFs) in the Greater London Authority (GLA) planning team.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Welcome, all of you. Thank you very much indeed for giving up your time.

Darren, I understand you are going to make a quick presentation to us on IAs and we will use that to start the meeting.

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): Yes. If that is OK, I was just going to set the scene and give you a brief overview of IAs.¹ They are set out in the London Plan. You will all be aware of that document. They are generally built-up areas with good existing or potential public transport accessibility and can support redevelopment at higher densities. The main difference between an IA and an Opportunity Area (OA) is the level of development that we think they have capacity for. The OAs have a minimum of 2,500 homes and 2,000 jobs, whereas the IAs are much lower at 1,000 homes. It is a lower threshold.

I just wanted to give a bit of history because IAs have been in the plan since the very first London Plan, which was adopted in 2004. Over time, there have been a number of changes with them. That is the map from the 2004 [Slide 2], showing you that there were at that time 14 IAs identified along with the other OAs, which are the grey stars. On the computer it is maybe not as easy to see those on there. They are not the blue ones; they are the grey ones on there. They were identified back in 2004 as areas of intensification.

What has happened over time is a number of things. Firstly, because they were identified, they are areas of redevelopment and over time redevelopment has occurred in those places and so they have come out of the London Plan as development has happened. In places like Arsenal/Holloway, we have seen significant redevelopment. In others, because of the work that was done in terms of looking at capacity, they have found

¹ The presentation is attached at Appendix 1 to the minutes and can be accessed on the GLA's website here: <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=303&MIId=5641&Ver=4>

more capacity and have been re-designated as OAs. Over time it was found that there was more capacity for homes and for jobs in those areas and so they were upgraded, if you like, to OAs with a higher threshold. There are a number of those. For example, Beckton is now part of the Royals OAPF. Euston is an OA in its own right; we have just adopted an Area Action Plan for Euston. Places like Colindale have emerged as OAs.

Then, if we move forward to 2015 and where we are now, you can see that, firstly, there are more OAs and we have had a number of additions to that. In the last iteration of the London Plan, five new OAs were designated. As you can see, the number of IAs has reduced and we are down to now a core number either, as I said, because of the development that has happened or because they have been upgraded to OAs when development is not happening or we are producing a framework.

What we do over time is we work with the boroughs on these frameworks and we have a number of ways of working with them. For example, if we think the borough is just getting on with it and doing its own borough plan, perhaps through a Local Plan or an Area Action Plan, and doing the planning framework for an area, often we will allow it to get on with it.

For example, there is Kidbrooke where Greenwich has worked closely with the developer there in creating what is almost a new village in London. They have got on with doing that and we are seeing a new community emerge there. The support that we have given is really just in terms of our role in commenting on the planning applications as they have come forward, supporting the area and making sure that things like the infrastructure are provided in that area.

In other places - for example, in Harrow - we worked very closely with them on the Area Action Plan. There, Harrow said, "We have identified this as a local IA. We actually need a bit of support to make that happen". What the GLA did was to second a planning officer to Harrow to help it prepare the Area Action Plan. I am just introducing the photograph on what happened there [Slide 4]. A number of years ago - I think it was back in 2009 - they approached us and then we worked with them to produce this area action plan. This is a good example where, because of the work we did looking at the capacity of the area and looking at the sites that were available for development, we discovered there was more capacity there than we had originally thought. In the last iteration of the London Plan, this area has now been upgraded to an OA because it has that higher level of capacity. We worked with Harrow in partnership to adopt that Area Action Plan, which is a formal planning document, to allocate the sites and set out the level of development in the area.

In terms of our role in them, we are here to support the boroughs in realising those IAs. Through the London Plan, we promote those areas. It is about promotion and publicity and making sure that developers, landowners and people are aware of the opportunities that these areas have.

We will also be working in partnership with TfL because one of the key challenges is often transport. What we did was identify these areas and work with TfL to look at what the transport needs of the area are to unlock that capacity for development, which is really where we work closely with TfL on the planning framework. A major chapter of the planning framework is the transport one. Often, it is about new infrastructure and new transport connections that unlock the large reservoirs on those big brownfield sites.

That is just a quick canter through the history of where we are with IAs. As you see, over time, either development happens and they come off the list or we find more capacity and they are raised up to become OAs.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Thank you very much. That was very useful. Can you walk me through what the advantage of designating an IA is, rather than just letting boroughs have their own regeneration plans and getting on with it?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): As I mentioned, the first one is that the London Plan, because it is a document for the whole of London, has a lot of publicity and a lot of status. It highlights to developers, to investors and to infrastructure providers where changes are going to happen and so it helps highlight to developers where the opportunities are and where we would like to see development.

One of the key policies of the London Plan is about London accommodating its own housing needs and employment needs without needing to go into the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land or going outside London. A lot of these areas we identify – particularly the IAs and the OAs – are generally these large areas of brownfield sites. They are suitable for redevelopment but often there are challenges with them: they are contaminated, they have poor transport access or they have infrastructure requirements. By highlighting them in the London Plan, we are flagging up to investors and infrastructure providers where the key sites are that we see development happening.

We then will support boroughs in producing frameworks for those areas. As I said, as with Harrow, we might do it more positively through seconding staff. With Greenwich, they are happy to get on with the work and we just support them in terms of our statutory role, having planning applications coming forward and supporting their ambitions for growth.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): The issue of planning applications is an interesting one because one of the things that can hold up development is the planning process itself. That can take, sometimes, a very long time.

Is there a way – or does it happen in IAs – that the planning process is fast-tracked? Is that something we would push?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): The principle of identifying them in the London Plan and then through the Local Plans is that it is quicker to get planning permission in those areas. You are already highlighting that they are areas where the boroughs will have redevelopment – often at higher density – of housing and employment. Often what happens is the policies in the London Plan are translated through to the Local Plans.

Another role that the GLA and the Mayor have is this power of general conformity. We will look at the Local Plans and we will want to make sure that they are fully recognising the potential of those areas.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): The plan is the strategic framework. The actual process of taking the application through from receipt to delivery is in the hands of the boroughs. In that case, Stephen, do you fast-track planning applications in IAs?

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): I have more experience, actually, in Harrow than I have in Haringey because the focus in Haringey over the last 12 months has been on Tottenham as an area of change in the Housing Zone and so on. Interestingly, the Haringey Heartlands IA is only now starting to emerge as one of the key options.

In terms of fast-tracking applications, my experience was that the process that Darren [Richards] has described of moving from designation of an IA and the joint preparation of an Area Action Plan and all of the engagement with members, partners and the community that goes with that has the effect of, in a sense, speeding up and resolving a lot of the issues that are the reasons why planning applications do not go well when they are submitted. In Harrow, my experience was we deliberately used the IA – we called the Heart of Harrow – as a tool for justifying engagement with the community on the preparation of the plan, working with

Graham [Jones, former Chief Planning Officer, Environmental Services, London Borough of Harrow] and the GLA, and also as, in a sense a call to the wider community and the Council to seize an opportunity that was being created there.

One of the things that is going to be quite interesting is obviously that the Government is consulting on this permission-in-principle concept where, effectively, an outline planning permission gets granted on the allocation of a site in a development plan. One of the things that we quite deliberately did – and, in fact, one of the things that on reflection Haringey does not yet have – is we wanted to in Harrow prepare a joint Area Action Plan with the GLA, firstly because it builds collaboration and confidence. We were trying to align TfL towards our project to try to get work around improved station access. Looking forwards, there is a role and the collaborative process of plan-making may well speed up the planning process even more with this concept of permission-in-principle. In other words, once you have drawn a line around a site and put it in your Area Action Plan, it is akin to an old outline planning permission. That will act as quite a powerful impetus for developer interest and for reducing some of the risks of the process that take place from there.

Harrow had a fairly challenging dialogue with its community around change. The IA designation, because it hardens that dialogue into a proper discussion with the community as you bring forward and allocate sites, but also as you try to say, “Look, here is a great opportunity to get what we want and to work with the Mayor’s Office, TfL and so on for outcomes that you locally have told us about and here are the consequences”, and working through the trade-offs.

Things like the Dandara scheme – we call it the ‘Dandara scheme’; it is of course College Road in Harrow – started life as a very awkward position for the Council. It was recently consented with a new development – and others will comment better than me who were closer – in a relatively straightforward and mutually understood aspiration for a site. I see that as a proxy for the benefits that can happen if you use this type of tool as a way to have a conversation.

In Wood Green, we are now starting to prepare our own Area Action Plan to achieve the same kind of purpose: to bring people together to have conversations and in turn to then shorten the application process but, importantly and critically, to deliver confidence to developers that it is worth spending the money, that the organisation is prepared to deliver and that it is actually inviting that delivery to happen.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Darren, you wanted to come back in?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): Yes, just on the alternative perspectives, I have worked in two boroughs that had neither OAs nor IAs. It was very difficult to persuade investors and developers that it was a place worth spending their time in and it was very difficult to get good schemes. We had schemes coming through, but they were not of the best quality; you did not get the best architects; you did not get the best house builders.

What we are seeing now is that almost every borough is covered by an OA. One of my previous boroughs, The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames, has put forward that it wants its town centre to be an OA. There is a factor in terms of being identified in the London Plan. Certainly as a planner working in the borough, I felt I had fewer levers to pull in terms of attracting the right kind of investment because I did not have the *cachet* and the influence and that having that identification and being able to draw on the GLA’s assistance would have helped me.

Also, as Stephen [Kelly] said, in terms of getting public acceptance of the need for development, it was difficult in the boroughs I was in – which were traditional suburban boroughs – and the need for change, that town centres are going to have to change, that we will need more housing and that kind of thing. That would

have been easier if we had been identified in the London Plan as an IA because it starts preparing the way or the journey for the community, councillors, residents and businesses about the likely change.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Has the GLA seen the rate of progress it expected when it was designating IAs?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): We have certainly seen through the emergence of OAs and IAs becoming OAs that there was more potential there than we had first anticipated.

We did not set a target in terms of how many would have frameworks and how many would be developed. This predates my involvement with them, but at the time – certainly at the time of the 2004 London Plan – the GLA was regarded very much as a very strategic organisation. It did not have the same powers that we have now. In terms of the devolution agenda, the Mayor is now looking at how we drive increasing housing and we will play a more upfront role in monitoring them.

Through the Annual Monitoring Report, we monitor housing completions and we also monitor progress on the IAs and OAs. Over the last couple of years, we are ramping up the number that we are doing, the number of frameworks we are producing and the work we are doing with the boroughs. It is partly in response to the need to increase the housing figures and these are the big areas that we want to concentrate on.

The answer to your question is that, in terms of the size of the forward plan, we have exceeded their expectations in terms of the amount of housing that we are seeing out of them. However, because of the challenges now, we need to do more to support and drive them to realise the opportunities that we have now, particularly given some of the challenges. Alex [Williams] maybe can talk more about that, but certainly in terms of the transport some of the areas have significant challenges in terms of being able to accommodate development because of transport linkages.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): We are going to see one very soon. Are there any of the IAs that you are particularly worried about at this stage?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): What I would say is that they are all different. One of the things about working with OAs is that there is not one size that fits all because the geographies are different, the boroughs are different and there are different issues around them. If you take one, Farringdon/Smithfield, the issue there will be around London's wholesale markets and the future of those, which is a London-wide issue. That area can only come forward when we have solved a wider area. Stephen [Kelly] has mentioned Haringey Heartlands. That has come forward now as an OA and that has a different set of challenges in terms of bring that forward.

We are doing a review of the London Plan and one of the things we will want to do is look again at this list and look at the rationale for IAs, look at progress on them and do some more in-depth analysis of what status they are at, what more support we need to give them, whether or not they remain as IAs or become OAs or whether they become something else. That is true for the OAs as well.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): When the Mayor or the GLA designate IAs or OAs, if they do not deliver and if they are not making the right progress that they should, what sanction is available to the Mayor?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): There are a number of sanctions. If we go back to the powers over the referral applications, the Mayor currently can advise on them, can object to them and can raise comments on them. For example, if applications come forward that boroughs are resisting in those areas, hypothetically, the Mayor would use the fact that it is an IA as a positive factor when commenting on any

applications that come forward. There, we would want to be encouraging redevelopment and higher densities and so the Mayor could be encouraging that through pre-application discussions with developers and comments on application.

We also have powers around general conformity and commenting on Local Plans. If we think a borough is not making the most of that area, the Mayor will put comments in on the draft versions of the Local Plan and can ultimately appear at the Examination in Public and put forward their proposals.

The other, more positive measures are things like Housing Zones, using investment, perhaps addressing the barriers to development in those areas, supporting the boroughs to --

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): That is not really a sanction, though, is it? That is almost a reward for bad behaviour.

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): The Housing Zones come with strings now. There is a contract and we expect boroughs and developers to deliver to a certain time period. There is a delivery contract --

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): If they do not, what happens?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): If it is grant, it is money and I assume there is a contractual arrangement about refunds.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): It gets withdrawn? OK.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): The Mayor can intervene in the planning process. In Housing Zones, if the boroughs are not consenting the scale of development that is appropriate for the Housing Zone, the Mayor has the right to intervene.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): He can intervene and impose permission, can he not?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): He can take over the planning authority role, yes.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): The Mayor has sanctions in the event that a planning application comes in. Of course, the objective is to get planning applications and get the locally consented or locally supported.

It is quite interesting with the perspective of being in Haringey now and having been in Harrow. The fundamental difference is that I suspect that the challenge with Haringey Heartlands is that it was forgotten. There was huge excitement around Tottenham and all sorts of mayoral focus around Tottenham and a real drive. There is consent for 1,000 dwellings on National Grid² [land], which form the cornerstone of Haringey Heartlands. In fact, the Council has permitted about 600 other dwellings in Haringey Heartlands, which are onsite with Berkeley Homes at this moment in time.

The big difference, though, with Harrow is that, firstly, there was a clear focus on the Heart of Harrow. We worked quite deliberately on the focus on the Heart of Harrow. The most compelling components of what the Mayor was able to deliver and what the GLA was able to deliver for us was alignment - so the conversations with TfL that we just could not have had before we had the IA designation - and a sense that the planning side

² In September 2011, National Grid was granted planning permission to redevelop its derelict Clarendon Gas Works Haringey Heartlands site

of the GLA, the regeneration side of the GLA and TfL were supportive of what we were trying to achieve in those constructive conversations.

What made a difference for external organisations, the land securities and the development side, was the Outer London Fund that we quite deliberately targeted towards Harrow and the sense of possibility that that creates and excitement. Officers had been going around planning departments and going around saying, "The Heart of Harrow is going to be really exciting. We are working with it". Nothing much was visible on the ground. Some catalytic funding through the Outer London Fund Round 1 did some events in Harrow that started to get people to rethink their perception of the place. Then the Outer London Fund Round 2 started to put some more long-term infrastructure in and narrate the story that we had all been working very hard to tell. Of course, then the development industry and the consented schemes that we saw started to gain traction in terms of the local community. Success breeds success, does it not? Confidence goes up. Local communities see that, actually, they appear to be delivering something.

It is interesting to compare that with Haringey, where the discussion has been about individual sites that benefit from a higher density calculation in an IA non-statutory planning framework, which seemed to be the be-all and end-all of the conversation and this was an opportunity for developers to get more houses rather than necessarily to create place.

There is a really exciting discussion emerging in Wood Green now that is adding energy to the process of an Area Action Plan around Crossrail 2 and the town centre's role. There is an irony that the IA in Wood Green is not in Wood Green and does not touch Wood Green town centre. There is a Metropolitan Town Centre and it sits to the side of it. I suspect there is a lesson around anchoring IAs in places that are town centres, even if you extend them, because it then creates a much more compelling mixed offer for the businesses and communities that use those places. Wood Green is a very popular town centre. The challenge is actually getting other people to think about it and to build confidence in the businesses that homes, commercial benefits and employment can come.

If the energy of the collective organisation of the borough and the GLA family is applied with a small amount of funding - and we have some town centre funding from the Mayor that is just starting to bite into Wood Green and we had a TfL scheme for the public realm - that is the piece that moves you from a sense that it is all planning designation and not really substance to a circumstance in which local communities can start to understand what it is that we might be delivering. It is less about sanction, in my mind, and more about focus and doing some little things that demonstrate the art of the possible.

Harrow now has a bid in place and has much more confidence in that happening. In Haringey, we are just at the beginning of that journey and we are redrawing the boundaries. The reason we are asking the GLA to consider us for the next iteration of the London Plan as an OA is because we want the town centre in it. It is the town centre that really creates a compelling place offer. Of course, substantially, Crossrail 2 is a game-changer from that perspective, too.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): I have a couple of questions. We have talked about fast-tracking planning applications to have real action in progressing projects. There is another issue that one needs to look at and I would like to draw the panel's comments. How can we encourage developers who, after getting planning consents on key sites, sometimes will not proceed with the development within the foreseeable future? In that area, it obviously impacts on the whole vision for regeneration. What can and should be done about this? Faraz?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Before I try to answer that, if I can just refer to some of the points about the designation and what the experiences following that are, it will help then to answer your question as to where we get to in terms of consents.

First and foremost, having the designation is clearly something that authorities want to seek to have because they feel they will get a collective set of support from City Hall in being able to deliver services in terms of both planning and transportation. Therefore, you can see that from a local authority's perspective wanting to have a designation, whether it is an OA or an IA, is a must-have if they are going to see the sort of regeneration they want to see and get the resources they want to see.

However, when you then look at the London Plan, which we have heard is a sort of promotional tool, you will see there are 38 OAs there and seven IAs. In fact, there are a further four OAs on the offing, taking that up to 42 OAs. We will see how many more IAs come forward as well. When you think about that quantum and about these large brownfield sites coming forward and having to be delivered, there is clearly going to be a sense of resource prioritisation that City Hall, TfL and other bodies are going to have to think carefully about and how they are going to, essentially, get the low-hanging fruit to deliver what they think is achievable within the OAs or IAs each of the authorities have put forward.

However, when you look underneath the bid of the 38 or the seven, you then want to know what exactly the plan is, what exactly the vision is and how they are going to get to that vision. You will then notice under those designations, if we take OAs, only 20 or so actually have an OAPF. We did not get quite the answer from Darren [Richards] on how many Area Action Plans and how much progress is actually being made on those IAs because the truth is they are all at different stages and, if truth be told, we do not really know because there is no real publicly available portal or information flow telling us what the status is of all of these. We have to then think about what information is actually available to us to understand where we are in terms of the deliverability of them and that comes back to where applicants are going to be interested or not.

Therefore, on one hand, yes, it is good to have the badge. However, actually, there is a lot of homework that then has to happen as a consequence to get to a place where investors and applicants will come forward realistically to say, "We are interested in doing something on X site".

Part of the sanction is that you have committed as a borough - and remember these are borough-led initiatives, primarily - and are saying to the Mayor and the team, "We are committed to delivering development". However, if that deal is not then made with the following homework, whether it is the Area Action Plan or the OAPF, you have to question the legitimacy or the hunger of that authority for pushing forward to do what it had initially set out to do. Ultimately, these are examined at the London Plan Examination to be designated. Therefore, there is a bit of lack of information as to what they are planning to do.

There is also, probably, on those OAPFs and those area action plans less of a business focus in terms of how they are going to deliver that vision in a business-friendly environment and where that information is available for those applicants to come looking for it. One of the things we have often said is, "Having a business planning framework", so that investors and applicants know where they can come and know the status of what is required in terms of delivering these sites. There obviously needs to be an online portal, which could be simply just telling you what is going on.

You then come down to the fact of prioritising. One thing that we have suggested is that City Hall has to be honest and essentially come forward with a very clear plan of prioritisation. Where is it going to prioritise the investment for the infrastructure, the transport, getting the power in and all the different services that will prepare the site to come forward for development? That is not very clear at the moment and so a clear

categorisation that tells us very upfront, from an investor and applicant perspective, “This is what you are going to get in order for you to come forward with development”, will be hugely influential in bringing that money and that investment quickly to those sites to come forward.

Coming to the question about those applications, again, it comes back to the planning process. Part of the deal of being an IA and part of the deal of being an OA is that you simplify the planning process. I am afraid to say that there are some authorities that have not quite got to the stage where they have simplified the planning process to an extent where they are expecting the applicant to go almost from stage one and start the process as if it was not designated in any such way. The planning process, I am afraid, is not as simple as it could be.

There is a real recommendation that could come through there. If you are going to be designated as an OA or an IA, put a simplified planning system in – whether it is a Local Development Order – or what Stephen [Kelly] has said. Clearly, down the line, there will be a principle-and-permission proposition for brownfield sites. Whatever that process is, it has to almost overlay a process of early planning processes, which we would almost argue should have been done as part of the designation process. Once you have the commitment that you know you have the simplified planning in place, actually, you will find that a lot more will flow quite quickly because you will have the investment coming through to deliver the social and physical infrastructure. You will have the confidence to do the development you desire. However, at the moment, it is all a little bit like, “We are hoping to do this. This is all very visionary”. Those ifs and buts need to be resolved to become factual, “These are the deliverables that will happen”. When you get that, the confidence will come with those applicants and the funding will come from those applicants to deliver those sites.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): I do not dispute any of what you said, but we still get problems where for some reason a developer decides to sit on that valuable site. Should the Mayor, for example, have any powers or should there be a mechanism that expedites the development, which is so crucial?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): It all depends on what the issue is and why the development has stalled; if it was, for example, a viability issue, say the section 106 was not quite right or the cumulative planning obligations for the site did not quite add up. Part of the understanding of the many of these sites is, although we call them OAs and IAs, in truth they are challenge areas. These are areas that do require significant upfront investment to actually catalyse the development and, in some cases, the viability will simply not stack up. Where a borough leader might want a lot of affordable housing or a school or a nursery or whatever it might be, it may come and it probably will come but it might not come at the beginning because you have to create a market and you have to create a value in the site. To unlock some of that, you might have to make concessions to allow the development to start, essentially, creating a place.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, which it is not.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): The question is about where the Mayor plays a role. The Mayor may play a role in creating a clear benchmark on what the viability issue is and where he/she believes they can intervene to ensure that that development can proceed but looking at the clawback for where he/she can make sure that the planning gain is brought back into the site at the right time. Again, it comes back to the planning issue.

In a generic sense, if the Mayor does not feel enough progress is being made either by the authority or indeed the applicant, clearly, that comes down to the consent itself and whether or not that consent should simply be taken off, a sort of ‘use it or lose it’ affair. However, before you get to that, there is a whole cacophony of things you have to look at and unravel to understand what the issue around that planning application was. I

do not think it is a simple answer of just saying that you would take it off without understanding the site-specific issues.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): The point about viability is quite pertinent, but to get stalled schemes going the authority has to be pragmatic and realistic about the benefit of things happening versus the benefit of, in a sense, holding out for the final piece on the section 106.

The other thing that will be quite interesting will be thinking forward around changes to compulsory purchase order (CPO) provisions and the development plan framework that exists in a particular context or area. The Mayor has a role not within the IAs in Haringey or Harrow but certainly in places like Tottenham, where we are already finding that things like the Housing Zones designation is quite a powerful tool for promoting collaboration and early activity. Of course, it is the public sector investing in sites and at the same time creating a clear understanding about how we want things to happen. We are introducing a development plan policy in our Area Action Plan that is quite deliberately talking about site assembly and about sites coming forward as a single piece and the authority, working with the Mayor's Office, potentially to acquire sites where that does not happen. Setting out a very clear vision in your statutory plan around the expectations for delivery and being mindful that you may well need to use that improves the prospects for CPOs in circumstances where people are just sitting on land.

It is about a realistic understanding of viability and a process of internal arbitration with partners about what we can do to incentivise a developer coming forward. The Mayor has a huge number of tools. It used to be the affordable housing grant but there is some form of top-up grant capability. There is infrastructure investment that is in the Housing Zones being channelled towards offsets in terms of public realm costs or liabilities associated with power and infrastructure. Some of these infrastructure issues are barriers to investment. That will allow developers a slightly broader perspective and also fewer places to hide behind. There is an expectation around both, really.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): Stephen, you mentioned the Outer London Fund, which does, obviously, help lift through the public realm whatever initiatives in the local areas.

I want to move a little bit deeper into that. The success of a lot of this regeneration and large projects also depends, in my view, on the real investment in infrastructure, particularly public transport and so on. Should that be part of the package when you look at developing large areas, whether they are IAs or OAs, something which does not happen that is actually a huge issue, both in the short and long term? You could have successful planning projects all developing a site and so on, but then you suddenly find that there is a capacity issue when it comes to infrastructure and therefore the pump-priming fund, which needs to be really at the top of the agenda.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): Alex might have something to say.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): Yes, I would be happy to.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): There seems to be direct and indirect investment. There is direct investment in helping a site or a scheme come forward and the Mayor has done some of that in the past. What is interesting to me in terms of infrastructure limitations is that it is all relative. Having worked outside of London where you were looking at hundreds of millions of pounds' worth of new motorway junctions just to give consent to a new housing scheme, we are in a slightly different place for some of our IAs.

Indirect investment, though, towards infrastructure such as Crossrail 2 will transform, for example, Haringey Heartlands' success prospects as well as expectation around the delivery. In Harrow, we declared the IA as a means to engage TfL in step-free access at Harrow-on-the-Hill Station and as a tool for that kind of conversation.

However, the infrastructure piece – not just the Mayor's infrastructure but also healthcare providers and so on – and the difference between a statutory planning framework and a non-statutory planning framework is something that the panel perhaps might want to think about as well. Haringey Heartlands has a non-statutory document. When push comes to shove, developers will give that a limited amount of weight. A statutory Area Action Plan in Harrow was far more meaningful as a tool. Developers will rock up and say, "This all looks good. It is in a document". Their funders are increasingly asking questions about the reliability and resilience of the designations in those documents. I am sure Alex has more.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): In terms of the infrastructure investment, there is a big difference between the OAs and the IAs. With the OAs, often you do not have the transport infrastructure there at all – somewhere like Old Oak Common – or you need significant investment to enhance the infrastructure to deal with the capacity constraints that are there now.

With the IAs, it is a very different position in the sense that, of all the seven we have here, all of them have established and relatively good public transport services connecting them. All of them have investment planned or being worked on for schemes to enhance the existing infrastructure. Some of them are transformational. If you think about Farringdon, when Crossrail and Thameslink are fully operation, the station will have 140 trains an hour. There is no capacity constraint at Farringdon once you have that level of connectivity there. However, clearly, there are issues about how the public realm copes in that area with dispersal and whether the stations cope with that kind of scale of demand. It is a different ask for the intensification. It is a more localised ask about whether the station is good enough and whether the public realm is good enough in the area. We are working on all of these in terms of the station projects or public realm projects and maybe looking at our own development portfolio to help unlock that as well. I would --

Andrew Dismore AM: In fact, I think that is a load of tosh. At Mill Hill East, there is a single-line train, a quarter-of-an-hour shuttle service most of the day. We have been pushing for an upgrade of the station. We were told that will only come out of excess profits from the developer when Nelson gets his eye back because it can limit its excessive profit and it cannot cope. At Holborn, the Tube station there is dramatically overcrowded.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): Yes, and we are working on that.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes, but when? We do not have step-free access at West Hampstead Tube Station and so you do not actually have the full interchange sorted out. You have step-free access at the Overground station but not the other one and so you do not have the full interchange. I am told, again, "It is whenever, whenever, whenever". For these things, it is the sequencing of all of this. The infrastructure needs to be there before the development happens.

At Colindale – although it is not one of these; it is the OA – the Tube station there is a joke. Eventually, it may get upgraded. It is supposed to get upgraded, but that is going to be long after these developments have thousands of people there. It puts huge pressure on the surrounding areas. This is simply not good enough because it is just far too late.

Again, if we are on infrastructure generally, if we look at the Mill Hill East one, half of the estate does not have broadband and cannot because they were not connected up.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): In terms of transport infrastructure, we are working on all four of the locations you have talked about. At Mill Hill East, there is a development agreement to fund step-free access at that station --

Andrew Dismore AM: Only after excess profits.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): Yes, I am aware of that and it has not been delivered as quickly as we would have liked. We also have our land to throw into the mix and we are keen to look at a development proposal in and around that station using our land to help maybe accelerate that delivery.

West Hampstead is an incredibly well connected part of London. When you look at the IA, you are only looking at 800 homes there. Actually, given its connectivity, you could look at potentially having more than that there. Clearly, you have three stations there. You have had the improvements to Thameslink. There are improvements for the London Overground, as you probably know, and there is more to do on the Jubilee and Metropolitan line stations. There is more to do there, definitely. I am not saying it is fixed, but I am just highlighting that we have station projects at all of these seven areas.

In Holborn, I entirely agree that the station is not as good as it should be and we are looking at a project for a new ticket-hall entrance with the local authority and public realm changes to take out the gyratory. That is in our business plan at the moment.

Andrew Dismore AM: For when?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): We will have to debate the timing with the borough in terms of when it wants the public realm done. I do not know the definitive date, but it is in our business plan. I think it is circa 2020 for the new station for Holborn. Then there are also the public realm changes and where we need to debate with Camden is when we do the public realm changes and when we do the station.

At Colindale, we are pretty close to a deal to deliver a new station at that location with money from the local authority, money from the developer and, potentially, money from us to do step-free. What we have not locked down yet is the timing for the delivery of that, but effectively it will be --

Andrew Dismore AM: The original idea was to have a whole new station. That has obviously gone by the wayside.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): No, that is what we have negotiated. We have negotiated a whole new station.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): We are getting slightly into a bit of granular detail here, which we need to step back from a wee bit.

Andrew Dismore AM: Yes. Sorry. It is just that when I heard that answer, it was a headline-grabber.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Just to answer both Navin [Shah AM] and Andrew's point here, which was in terms of infrastructure delivery, clearly, we have the London Plan 2015 and we clearly know that within the Infrastructure Delivery Board there is a governance structure in place as well.

One of the things that would help both OAs and IAs is if the GLA created deliverable infrastructure delivery plans so that we clearly know what is going to happen and when it is going to happen. It is not just the TfL world. It is the digital side. It is the power side. It is that social infrastructure. If each of these areas had really credible plans, this comes back to not just having an Area Action Plan and not just having an OAPF but having a proper business plan that has a subset of this information. We are all on the same page then and we all know what is going to happen when. It is just that basic project management skill that we need to have underneath that.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. I would endorse that. There is a whole long list where work is being done. One cannot deny that locally. The question is when you are going to deliver it. That is where the biggest problem is. That is where the timing is critical and it is not happening.

Anyway, if I can move on to the question I have here, Faraz, at London First you have produced a report with an analysis of OAs. Given what we have been discussing now today, is there any chance that you might want to focus on the IAs in terms of what you reckon should be the priorities and your own critique, in a sense, to help regeneration?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Thank you for that. London First produced a report called *Opportunity Knocks* and I am happy to get copies through to Jo [Sloman, Scrutiny Manager, GLA] if that is helpful. We have produced ten recommendations around the focus around OAs, although we accept that IAs also have a very similar bias in the nature of what they are trying to achieve as well.

First and foremost, we are keen to see a number of those recommendations that we have introduced in the report pushed through to the GLA to introduce. That ranges from looking at the governance structure, how these things are managed in terms of City Hall's relationship with the boroughs and the boroughs working with City Hall, how they are more business focused than they currently are, what information is available on IAs in terms of where they have got to and where they want to go to, and knowing what support the GLA is going to provide.

One of the things we often worry about is the resource that boroughs are up against in terms of their planning departments and their ability to deal with these. Even IAs, at 1,000 homes a pot, are still very large schemes. Where are the skills coming from for the planning department where they can handle major applications? Is there a calling where the Mayor has, if you will, at this time a GLA advisory team beyond what he has at the moment, a very dedicated team that can help - as we have heard with Stephen [Kelly] with his example - and come in and work directly with a borough to assist it and navigate it through that planning process to the delivery stage. It is not just planning. It is the economic regeneration side. It is the infrastructure side as well. There is something about centralising resource that can be tapped into by all 32 London boroughs.

Then there is a point about this land assembly, this viability and this land value point. We can go around the whole circle talking about how the viability assessment and talking about how that land assembly is going to happen. Again, this is where City Hall can play an instrumental role in helping by working with the boroughs to bring those elements together. These things, once they are resolved, will instil confidence in the development community to come forward.

There is a whole host of things that can happen. From our perspective, we have just launched a campaign called 50,000 homes a year and so we are very keen to see these sites developed. This is the real prize for any mayor in office because this is where the housing is going to be able to be delivered to meet the population growth that London is seeing. Therefore, it is an imperative for London First to continue to do this work. However, what we want to see immediately is some categorisation and some understanding of where those priorities are lying.

Back to your point, Chairman, earlier: what are the powers the Mayor has by way of sanction should the deliverables simply not materialise? Maybe the answer is de-designating. Maybe the answer is simply saying, "We have asked for you to deliver these things. Our partnership is this. If you have not done it, where is the confidence that we have to continue to do that commitment? Maybe we will de-designate you". This is a partnership --

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): It is a partnership.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Yes, this is a partnership. Remember that this is borough-led. This is not City Hall coming down. This is borough-led and so we need to create that relationship. If the relationship is not there, then we may have to think about that level of intervention.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): Would you say, Faraz, that most - if not all - of the recommendations are transferable to IAs? Is that right, really?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): I would say that that is right, yes.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): OK. You answered the question. What I was going to ask was: who should be leading the IA agenda itself. You just mentioned that it should be the boroughs to start with.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Yes, it is a borough-led proposition.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, but a partnership?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Yes.

Navin Shah AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. Then, following that, how this should be co-ordinated by the GLA?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Yes. As we have heard earlier and as we are seeing in the Housing and Planning Bill that is going through Parliament at the moment, the Mayor is getting extended planning powers. Whether it is a designated area or not, the Mayor will have these powers as a sort of safety valve if there is inaction on development anyway. Let us remind ourselves that outside of this world of designations - whether it is Housing Zones or IAs or OAs - that actually the Mayor is being empowered quite heavily with a number of planning powers from call-ins to 50 units through to permitted development rights (PDRs) for the extension of storeys. There are a number of tools in the Mayor's box to seek delivery as well.

However, clearly, there is a vision that has been brought up by the boroughs and a willingness to deliver by having these designations. Of course, one point that we have not touched on but is important to recognise is that one of the reasons why boroughs probably want the designations - apart from the fact that it brings in this collective resource - is of course other levers like Housing Zones are largely being designated in areas where you have these IAs and OAs. It is almost as if the default is, "You have to have that in order for us to give you this". Therefore, we have to unpack the legitimacy of all of that as well because it may be that some areas are just simply Housing Zones.

Andrew Dismore AM: Some of my residents might be very happy to see the de-designation of some of these sites, particularly in Colindale where they perceive huge overdevelopment and the impact on the pre-existing local community has been absolutely horrendous, as they would see it. I suppose the question I am coming to

is: what does this designation mean to local communities and local residents? I do not know if Stephen Kelly would like to come in.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): It depends. There is a whole suite of measures and the objective of all of the public authorities is to try to align those now. What works in some places may not necessarily be the same motivator in others.

However, it does seem to me that this point around it being borough-led and supported through partnerships with the GLA becomes really, really important provided the borough can identify what it wants from the process. Where it is at a plan-makers' convenience - and that is at a local level as well as at a regional level - what we have seen is perhaps a lack of energy or a lack of focus on that. Where it is genuine and energy is put into delivery, it becomes a far more productive piece because not only does the designation act as a tool for a dialogue with communities that asks what they want out of this process, but it should, shouldn't it, inform investment decisions by both the Mayor's Office and the boroughs themselves around where they want to spend their Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and how they want to support through section 106 or development for certain outcomes. In Harrow, we wanted a new library and step-free access. What is interesting in my experience is, in London's growth challenge, the designation of these places proved to be a really interesting means to have a conversation that, otherwise, would not have taken place.

When I arrived in Harrow, we had no designations at all. We had a Metropolitan Town Centre. We had some strong local opposition to growth, density and development. To my mind, the job of the planning service was to say, "Here is the challenge we have, then. If we are not going to have any focus and if we are not going to have any significant areas of change, how do we deal with London's growth? How do we engage with the future of London?" It is a really difficult question. What we tried to structure was a focus on place that people said they wanted to change and that they wanted better things to happen in - they did not want density and they did not want height but they wanted things to happen - and to use the process, the dialogue and the opportunity funds that came with it as a wide piece for discussion about choices. The Campaign for a Better Harrow Environment, as they called themselves, was vehemently opposed to density and growth but they wanted things to happen. We said, "Let us try to make things happen, but here are the choices we have to make around whether you want these things or not". The IA and following through from that the OA and now the Housing Zone, I suspect, is the natural progression of that dialogue from, "We can achieve this. We can achieve this. Now let us achieve this", and Harrow is springing forward to achieve even more.

Where that does not happen, I think is where communities lose faith. There does not appear to be a strategic plan for the whole borough and there is a suspicion in communities about an opportunism that infects the development process that they feel they do not have a stake in. My job as the Chief Planner is to try to find a way of saying, "Let us make some of these difficult choices but let us make them through a more strategic framework".

Andrew Dismore AM: What it comes down to, I suppose, is how good the local planning department is and how competent it is about engaging local people and involving local people. Are they not-in-my-backyarders (NIMBYs) or do they have a point? From what I have seen, most of the issue that is coming out from the communities I am representing is that they do actually have a point. Their concern is that that point is not being addressed and that there is no *quid pro quo*.

If you look at Colindale, for example, it is directly on point. As far as they are concerned, they have had absolutely nothing out of it other than grief and I think they are probably right. It is an area I know very well, obviously.

As far as Mill Hill is concerned, the issue there is, yes, they understand there has to be development but they want to see improvements to infrastructure and they see it just not happening. This is the point I was making earlier on. Maybe this suggests the point that you made about TfL and how trying to find out even what TfL's site is proves virtually impossible to establish, never mind what your intentions are for it. Again, in Mill Hill East, the developer said, "I do not want to put any affordable housing here. We will put that somewhere else. This area is going to be a premium for rich people", and the local community says, "We have always been a mixed community. What is all this about?"

Therefore, part of it is having proper engagement, as you say. The trouble is that in a lot of places - certainly in my experience - it is just not happening. Either there is no dialogue or it is a dialogue with the deaf. How would you overcome that?

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): There is a piece, though, which is about managing expectations and answering the question, as you rightly say, about, "What is in it for me?" The role of the boroughs - and parts of the boroughs like the planning departments - is to try to be clear about what can and cannot happen and then to continue to communicate with the communities about the progress of some of those things. Inevitably, unfortunately, some of the difficult infrastructure takes a lot longer to happen because - and Alex [Williams] will know better than me - of the way that the business case that gets investment in big-ticket infrastructure has to be quantified against growth and, picking up on the London First report, the confidence that that growth is actually going to happen.

Andrew Dismore AM: That is the chicken and the egg, isn't it, to some degree? The problem is that everybody sees the eggs but they do not see the chicken that you need to actually make the area work. You end up with all sorts of not just infrastructure but local services issues because the services are not there to support these communities. The existing communities see their existing services over loaded. Then, some long way down the track, somebody might actually think about doing something about it. It is not just transport; it is the doctors' surgeries, it is the schools, it is everything.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): I was going to talk about that because there is a real issue about community confidence when stuff is going to happen. In a different part of Haringey, we have had a really interesting engagement with the health providers because primary care is particularly poor in parts of the borough. In the plan process, the role that the borough and the GLA have in drawing those other providers into that story is a really important part. Some of the stuff that can be delivered is quite modest.

However, the reason that the Outer London Fund, and some of the funding schemes that the GLA has at its disposal to assist boroughs, is really important is that the "what is in it for the community" process retains the confidence of the community that things will happen. Of course, it is communication as well around those kinds of changes.

I cannot comment on Colindale. However, we were always clear that whether it is in Haringey delivering Crossrail 2 in the event that it is confirmed or, indeed, delivering step-free access at Harrow-on-the-Hill, it was a long-term proposition but in the meantime we would try to deliver new facilities and a network of spaces and public parks and infrastructure. That will never happen fast enough.

It is really important to say that IAs and OAs are not just about new houses for other people. They are about a better place.

Andrew Dismore AM: They should be about that, but I just question whether in fact that is the case.

Can I switch to the other side of the equation on these as well, which is the jobs side? The focus has been very much on the housing side. If I look at the targets for jobs in the chart we have here, in Mill Hill there is going to be a huge net loss of jobs and there is not going to be an increase in jobs, a huge net loss of jobs, I know, for example.

What impact will the PDRs change have on all this as well? We are seeing less office space all over the place, particularly in outer London, but not only that. We are also seeing it in Camden Town as well with the office blocks that they are chucking everybody out of and turning them into blocks of flats with no section 106 and no affordable accommodation thrown in.

How is the jobs side of this developing?

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): This is the cop-out answer, isn't it? It is difficult. There are a series of measures that in this moment at time appear to be unhelpful for boroughs in terms of trying to deliver, support and maintain jobs and quality employment in certain areas.

It comes back the sense to which you use some of the tools at your disposal, whether it is the use of Article 4 designations supported by a development plan allocation that then means, when you get a planning application, you can deal with or seek to balance the employment outcomes with the housing outcomes. Certainly in some parts of the IAs - and I do not know if Darren [Richards] still has his slide up - I suspect there are quite profound imbalances between viability and values that drive behaviours of investors towards the housing sector. The challenge for boroughs - and this is an earlier point I made around how it does seem unusual for Haringey's IA not to be focused on or incorporate Wood Green Metropolitan Town Centre, which is right next door - is that there is a wider dialogue that the GLA and boroughs are having around what London's future jobs are, what types of premises they need and how that premises is delivered or safeguarded. There are obviously structural changes that are taking place across London.

Faraz [Baber] will have a view about some of the big-box stuff that is still really important and of course some of it will be permitted development, I am fairly sure.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Yes. Just to be clear, IAs are aiming to deliver 8,000 jobs and the OAs in total just under 600,000 or 575,000 jobs and so, clearly, there is an objective for job creation in both of these designations.

The challenge, which Stephen rightly says, is how we ensure that industry has its role in many of these areas. Certainly we are working at the moment to help inform the next iteration of the London Plan about how industry and commerce have to support the community. We have moved, for example, on click-and-collect services so far that we need urban logistics centres right in the heart of many of these inner London sites just to service London. Therefore, there is a challenge about how we safeguard the right sites to allow these industries to come in to service the capital.

The challenge is what we do not want to see. Although we do need the 50,000 homes a year, absolutely, we do not want to just see swathes of housing estates. We need to see the right communities that support employment and logistics that allow not just the immediate area to function but the capital as a whole. Therefore, it is absolutely right for us to think more carefully about designations and maybe affirming them.

One of the things the Assembly might want to consider in this context is how we ensure the right policies are in the London Plan to make sure that that balance of industry and commerce remains important, keeping a clear vision and sight on the need to make sure that we also have the housing capacity that London needs as

well. There is this balancing act, but we do not want to lose one against the other. That is the danger of trying to drive forward housing, which is important, but we need to make sure that we have the right sites for urban logistics centres and other uses.

Whereas you might see the Haringey scheme where at the moment it is a swathe of industrial locations, a large proportion of that probably would be turned into housing to get the land captured in order to pay towards a contribution for Crossrail 2 – question mark – but, actually, we cannot just seek for all of that to go away because there is a role for that industrial use on those sites to come forward to help supplement the jobs.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): The emerging policy framework that we are trying to develop in Haringey is about job density in the same way that we are starting to talk about housing density because the employment land review work that we have done for Haringey – and I suspect for most outer London boroughs – would clearly indicate that viability for pure employment uses just does not exist in London because of the land values and the relative buoyancy and capacity of the market to pay outside of the central zone. What we are trying to do is to increasingly refine what employment space looks like at higher densities. It certainly does not look like swathes of notionally active ground-floor frontages at the bottom of residential blocks, which the development industry currently considers to be meeting the employment designation. Increasingly, we are having some quite interesting conversations with developers around how cross-subsidy takes place between employment and residential, which of course has implications for the discussion about affordable housing.

It is quite interesting that the changes to the Mayor's call-in or step-in powers are down to 50 units. I suspect a lot of those small sites will be dispersed employment sites, but there will be some care required around the messaging that goes with those kinds of step-in rights because they are often much more nuanced at that level in terms of employment, like the occasional small business site, which in current public transport accessibility level ratings does not need to be that large to get your 50 units.

It is about recognising the importance of things like Strategic Industrial Land designations, which the London Plan protects very effectively at this moment in time. There are issues around some of the waste sites. It also protects those.

However, the cornerstone of proper, sustainable places in terms of IAs or OAs will be about maintaining the right balance, but the consequences will impact on some really important policy challenges around affordable housing delivery because of the need for cross-subsidy of new space and a rethink of some of the interrelationships between employment space, work space and residential space that currently exist, which have pushed these things slightly apart.

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): Where there is a focus on jobs, you would expect the policies to reflect that and there has to be a balance. In some areas, it may well be that you want to protect employment land.

As an example, we are about to adopt the City Fringe OAPF and there is a heavy concentration in terms of protecting particularly low-value offices and cheaper accommodation for start-ups and for the kinds of industries we want to accommodate there. There are policies in that framework that encourage the provision of affordable work space alongside traditional employment maybe instead of affordable housing or other benefits. That is also used then in terms of either supporting Article 4s or, as we have done, the Mayor has had exemptions from the PDRs for all of the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and for the City Fringe area and for the Isle of Dogs.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is that going to continue when the PDRs are made permanent?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): There is a grace period of, I think, three years.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): It is a two-year grace period for now. Authorities have to put forward Article 4s to determine their own area.

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): We have just recently published for consultation the CAZ Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and there we are talking about the Mayor playing a role in co-ordinating with the boroughs those Article 4s. Through the IAs and in areas where our focus is for jobs, the Mayor and the boroughs would have policies there to protect employment and support Article 4s to prevent the loss of that office space.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): I guess in the case of the areas that you have been citing in Camden and Mill Hill, those authorities will need to think from now whether or not they would be considering to put an Article 4 submission forward, etc.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Faraz, in London at the moment we have local borough planning frameworks, Housing Zones, IAs, OAs and now Mayoral Development Corporations (MDCs). How do these various different planning designations interact with one another? The question in our brief is: are we in danger of being zoned out in London? Are we going to have lots of multiple overlapping areas for development with different planning regimes in different places?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): We like our designations in planning, do we not? It is a sort of *à la carte* menu on this, really.

The answer is that some complement each other and other simply are separate entities. The MDC itself is, arguably, a separate governance arrangement that works with the host boroughs but, rather than it being borough-led, it is a City Hall or Mayor-led entity. That said, obviously, that does not preclude those areas to also have a pick-and-mix from some of those, Housing Zones being a good example of that.

Taking Stephen's [Kelly] point from earlier, having some of these initiatives - which have come forward because either central Government has come forward with a set of grant funding or City Hall has managed to pull some money together - is no bad thing. I guess the point really comes down to how well it is all communicated. Is it right that you have to have one before the other? Sometimes you do not need one before the other; you can just go for the Housing Zone and you do not need to have the badge of honour of being an OA or an IA. It is not the case for all but there is a sense that, if you have that, you have this. It is rather like a local enterprise partnership (LEP). If you have a LEP, then you get other things that come in. It is not too dissimilar to that sort of model. The question comes down to the fact that an authority should use what it thinks it needs, as opposed to having to have the whole suite as part of a stepping stone. There may be good reasons that I cannot see that you have to have an OA to have a Housing Zone to have an X. However, the reality is that if you want to have a Housing Zone or if you want to have an OA, one of the things about signing up to be an OA or an IA is that you are prepared to look at density. That is part of the agreement, as well as having a simplified planning system. Therefore, in some ways, having a Housing Zone is building on the block of the agreement that was initially made, but there is no reason why that cannot be made in isolation if you just want to have a Housing Zone in a specific area.

From the local residents' perspective - who will not have planning expertise and will be simply looking at it from a layman's perspective - it is a pretty difficult arrangement to try to unravel and understand where you fit into this whole hierarchy. I have not even talked about neighbourhood planning.

When you think about a more strategic planning framework – and at the end of the day it comes down to individuals and what will matter to them – it can be quite complex. However, some of the Government's arrangements are important. The OA and IA processes are important for boroughs if they feel they are going to get a collective grouping of resourcing and prioritisation. I am not necessarily convinced you need to have one against the other against the other. Some of these can be done in isolation.

As we have seen in the presentation, there 38 OAs and we have 42 coming in by the time a new London Plan will happen. You start wondering how valuable the actual – I will not say 'sentiment' – value of the kitty becomes if you simply have the whole of London dotted with designations.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Do any of them cross borough boundaries?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Yes, there are a few that do.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): That introduces another level of complexity to it, does it not, because then you need to have two different authorities working in the same direction?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): The London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) covers five host boroughs.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): The LLDC is a MDC, as is Old Oak and Park Royal.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Indeed.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): I am talking about OAs.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): Earls Court covers two authorities. Of course, Haringey covers three or four as well.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): Yes.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): The answer is yes. That is not a problem. In some ways that is part of the – I am sorry; I am going to use another planning term now – duty to co-operate. That helps foster that duty to co-operate, which is no bad thing. You do not always need all the different bits of zones and designations to do the same thing. It just may be a Housing Zone to do what you need to do.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Pursuing the same avenue for a little bit longer, for those that do cross borough boundaries, are they working as efficiently as they might? Are we going to be seeing in the future, in your view, the rise of more and more MDCs to make things happen?

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): It is a mixed bag. There is a bit of local politics that comes into this.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Quite a lot, I would think, actually.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): We need to remember these are relatively large sites and so they do span both economic and political cycles. One of the challenges with this is feeling that an applicant has the certainty through the journey of doing these essentially large projects over very long cycles. Within our working group we have been grappling with what will help instil some level of confidence over those different economic and political cycles. It has to be that the more is understood about business

planning in terms of what is going to be delivered when and the more that is set in stone as far as possible – in terms of provision through to delivery – that will help instil more confidence even when there are changes, whether economic or political.

That does not mean to say it is not unduly unlikely for the new leader to want to have a shift in emphasis, whether that is around or affordable housing or more employment. That is invariably an absolute right for them to have. However, there has to be, if you will, a boundary within what is possible within the changing scope of a development. You cannot start throwing the whole kit and saying, “We are starting again”. You have to do it within a framework. That can only happen if you have a clear business plan – whether it is in the IAs or the OAs – so that you have confidence through what could be a 10- or 15-year cycle to develop that scheme. In that way you handle the cross-borough boundary changes that might happen.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): I am not suggesting there was not any discipline about designations to get to this point. However, there does seem to me to be a need for a set of criteria that you would have for the designation of an OA or IA. Obviously, we have heard that some are more successful than others. I am not suggesting that they are badges of honour, but there is a component at which they can be important as a quick fix for how we are going to do something.

Just listening to Faraz [Baber], it seems to me there is something around clarity in respect of why you are designating these spaces and places because they are very different. There are probably some questions to ask. There must be something around purpose – in other words, why – because it is going to be different in different cases. From my perspective there is something around the use of the profile. From other perspectives, there may well be something around investment.

Importantly – picking up on the point around business planning, the need for discipline and doing something beyond the “I have a designation in the London Plan” type of criteria – there must be something around collaboration. I suspect that asking questions around the purpose, how you are going to use the profile constructively, what about the investment that is coming with it, what we as the GLA can invest because they are a designation from you that which we reflect in our local plans, what level of investment comes through the business plan and so on from the borough level, and then how we are going to collaborate to deliver it. It is not a criticism but I do not think anybody asked me those questions as part of the dialogue that we had when we were designating Harrow & Wealdstone.

Not having worked those points through, which is Faraz’s [Baber] point, can lead to delay whilst you think about those things. Worse than that, it can lead to passive, fairly pedestrian progress on delivery, which diminishes the designation.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): Darren, do you have any views on that?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): That would be helpful. The London First report has been helpful. We are doing a bit of work internally looking at the point about categorisation. It is not necessarily about prioritisation. However, there is an issue about categorisation and about what each area needs and where it is in its lifecycle. The upcoming review of the London Plan that we are about to undertake is probably a good point for the kind of questions we should be asking about what the role of these areas is, what the purpose is, what the GLA has and what role the boroughs have. It is a really good point in terms of asking that, and an internal critique about the process, what we have done so far and what we have achieved. Certainly some of the 38 OAs have been there since the beginning. We probably do need to review where they are in their lifecycle in terms of the amount of development there, whether there is any more development that could be achieved there or not, or whether they have reached a point where they are now mature and they have given up their opportunity and that is it.

One thing that struck me in terms of the difference an IA and an OA is that OAs are often very large and often consist of very large vacant sites with large industrial or ex-industrial brownfield sites where there is not an existing community. It strikes me that in many of the IAs, because they are small and because they are often within an existing community, the kinds of things that -- The ones with real potential -- thinking about Barking Riverside and Bexley Riverside -- are large industrial areas. I can see one of the things that is different between IAs and some of the OAs is how you achieve development in existing mature residential areas where there are these opportunities, there is this change and how we go about doing that.

We see the OA frameworks as a good vehicle where there are cross-boundary issues. They can achieve something that boroughs cannot or boroughs may find it more difficult or slower to achieve, in terms of getting an overarching framework and some planning policies in place for a set of boroughs in an OA that then can reflect development. They also can be got through much more quickly than the statutory process. There is a tension between the statutory process, which takes a lot of time but gives you a lot of certainty, and the non-statutory process that we go through with some of these frameworks. We can do it much more speedily. We can get policies in place but, at the end of the day, you do not find the same level of certainty.

That is one of the issues driving the Mayor's request for greater devolution, which is to give some more certainty through the Mayor's powers that would then speed up the process in partnership with the boroughs. We know it takes time to get Local Plans in place but these opportunities do not wait for that. Sometimes the opportunities are there now and we need to reflect those until we come to that point about where residents might be affected and what the vision for the area is. The quicker we can put those policies in place the quicker the industry understands what is going to be required if they want to develop in those areas. That is where we think the benefit is -- the GLA helping boroughs to do these frameworks in advance of the statutory process can provide some of that certainty.

James Cleverly AM MP: Alex, it is to you to start with. TfL -- and this may be an unfair characterisation; you tell me -- has perhaps a reputation of setting an agenda and pushing for it with perhaps a bit of a tin ear to some of the other players in the spaces that you operate in. What assurances can you give us that TfL's development plans will be created in conjunction and with an awareness of things like the OAs, IAs and the future London Plan?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): There is a lot of very good work on the OAs. We are deeply embedded in work with local authorities, the GLA and major developers to help unlock that growth. A key part of that is the OAPFs and a supplementary document called the Development Infrastructure Funding Studies (DIFS), which tries to quantify the costs of all of the infrastructure to unlock the growth, both transport and non-transport, to make sure that happens. We play a leading role in all of those DIFS across London. It was part-and-parcel of unlocking the development at Battersea Nine Elms. We are an active participant in the planning frameworks being developed with the boroughs and the GLA and we will continue to be so.

With IAs, as I said earlier, it is a different level of involvement. It is more about individual station projects or our own development portfolio. Our development portfolio is a key part of this debate as well in terms of how we are bringing our sites that are surplus to requirements to the market to deliver the new homes and jobs that London desperately needs.

The best example of that from the list of IAs we have got here is Kidbrooke. You have the Berkeley Homes scheme on one side of the train station, which is a transformational estate regeneration project, and on the other side of the station there is a surplus TfL site. We are looking to develop circa 300 homes there, working with the local authority and the developers in the area to make sure that that development is acceptable to

local needs. We will be putting in a planning application next year. We are actively involved in all of the OAs and also increasingly involved when we bring our land to the market as well.

James Cleverly AM MP: I am trying to get my head around whether there is a regular pattern in those relationships. For example, is TfL typically the instigating player and then are the other players subordinate to that, or the other way round? Assembly Member Dismore highlighted circumstances where plans are put in place and there is a transport node. The perception is that once those plans come to fruition that transport node will not be adequate for the new environment in which it finds itself. You have highlighted somewhere where there seems to be quite a logical sequencing; major redevelopment work in Kidbrooke and then the freeing up of additional housing there. Is there a pattern or is it 'playing by ear' in terms of who the driver is and who is the subordinate?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): It does vary by site. Certainly, with a lot of the brownfield sites that Darren [Richards] referred to in east London, we are there at a formative stage. When you have industrial land with an OA designation, there is likely to be significant residential increasing pressure on the transport network. We are there at the formative stage to say, "What is the infrastructure you need to unlock that kind of growth?" Then we have that debate with the local authority and the GLA about how we are going to fund it and how long it will take to deliver.

There is sometimes a disconnect such as you have in Barking Riverside at the moment. There is some early housing there but you do not have the transport capacity there with the Gospel Oak to Barking Line extension. For years we were hoping to be able to deliver the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) there. That was unaffordable. We were never going to be able to deliver that at £750 million. We have gone for a cheaper but hopefully as effective transport solution of the Gospel Oak to Barking Line extension. A new rail extension or a new station is a complicated and expensive piece of kit and they take several years to deliver. We are going through consent now for the Gospel Oak to Barking Line and it will probably be open in 2021. You have maybe a couple of thousand units of housing there now without that connectivity. Once we get the train service, then you can go up to 12,000 to 14,000 units there.

Therefore, in the brownfield sites, we are involved at a formative stage. In some of the IAs we are looking at today, it is established communities around established transport nodes and it is about enhancing what you have there. It is a slightly different level of involvement. Holborn Station is a good example. It is trying to find a site to get the increased station capacity there and working with the local authority on that.

James Cleverly AM MP: Does TfL have a formal overlay whereby you map your development sites against the IAs, for example? Where there is convergence, are they prioritised?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): It is probably not as clear-cut as that. We have an overlay of all land that we own in the capital. That ranges from verges next to main roads to massive sites like Earls Court. We have prioritised the first 75 of those for going into development partnerships to get those to deliver a lot more homes and a lot more jobs. We are looking at the next tranche at the moment to see whether we should be looking at more sites coming to the market. The first tranche is principally in zones 1 and 2, the highest-value sites. Clearly we also need to look at zones 3 and 4 in the next tranche as well. It is a bit like Mill Hill East, really. It is not an active site now but in due course will be.

James Cleverly AM MP: This takes me back to the initial question/statement I made. You say those initial sites are typically in central London and are typically high-value. I get those. I am not questioning the business case for prioritising them. The question that triggers in my head is whether they were chosen because it was the best and most convenient business case for TfL irrespective of how they sit with regard to IAs or OAs or was their potential convergence with IAs and OAs an integral part of their selection criteria?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): It was part of the process but clearly the business case to develop these sites was the fundamental one. However, there is a correlation between the two. If it is an OA or an IA, you hopefully have that appetite for growth in that local area. Kidbrooke is an IA. The local authority is up for that growth and it makes it an interesting site for us to develop. It is quite a way out. It is probably zone 5. It is unusual for us to look at that. The OA and the IA designation is a demonstration of the appetite for growth, which does improve the business case.

James Cleverly AM MP: OK. All right, thank you. I get the glory of the final question today, which is, typically, one of these round-up questions.

We know that by this time next year we will have a new Mayor. This is your opportunity to get the first bids in early. We will have a new Mayor so what changes should the GLA be proposing to the new Mayor about how to improve IAs and OAs and what to put in the London Plan to really get the best out of this new opportunity? I am assuming you regard a new Mayor as an opportunity rather than a threat. I put that in your hands. Darren?

Darren Richards (Strategic Planning Manager, GLA): I will let colleagues answer. I have to serve whichever Mayor may be here.

I will repeat what we said before. Given the London First report, the work they are doing and the Further Alterations, it is clear there is significant change in London. We are facing a major increase in housing need. We are looking at the categorisation of the areas. We do need to think about how we go forward in terms of resources and what that particularly means in the context of the devolution powers and additional powers to the Mayor. Also, we need to think about what opportunities those new powers will give us in terms of making things happen in these OAs and IAs. Does it unlock new levers that we perhaps have not had before?

What we will be presenting to the Mayor will be what the future holds, where we are going with housing and employment projections, what a new London Plan may need to look at and what challenges we have in terms of accommodating housing need. A part of that will be the OAs and IAs. We will need to think about how we look again at them, what their purpose is, whether they are doing what we want them to do and - the fundamental question - what it is that we want them to do. That is where we will need to be with the new Mayor, presenting the facts, projections and the information we have gleaned, the achievements we have made with them and also some internal critique where they have not achieved those.

James Cleverly AM MP: I do not want to widen this out too much into a big philosophical thing but, just off the back of what Darren said, in addition to what I asked, could there also be a fundamentally better way of designating London to stimulate regeneration and economic growth? If the answer is no, that is fine.

Faraz Baber (Executive Director for Policy, London First): The ten quite sensible recommendations that my report sets out, which I would love the new Mayor - and indeed the existing Mayor, in fact - to take on almost immediately, would be my starting point.

On a more strategic level - and I think you touched on this, James - it is about TfL and the way it manages its thinking process around that. It is not necessarily its fault but it is a little bit more reactionary as opposed to visionary. In some ways, part of the ability to unlock some new sites - I am thinking particularly about the East End corridor of London - is looking at how you can reconfigure the existing infrastructure and transport. Think about the A13, for example. Is there another way one can reconfigure an area like that that opens out new areas for development and really unlocks the ability for development to come forward at a much faster pace than we are seeing at the moment? We obviously have the London Infrastructure Plan and we have the

delivery plans that sit there. However, is there a role for TfL to be more visionary around how it can think beyond the norm as to how it sets out new infrastructure and new strategies that help realise new areas to come forward with growth? There is something there which a new Mayor could activate with TfL straightaway to say, "Look, I want you to have a little bit more of a thinking-out-of-the-box approach beyond the refurbishment and regeneration of existing sites".

In terms of your exam question of whether we could do things differently, ultimately we can always play around with the structure and governance that we have. It is right that boroughs should be seen to be leading in their locality. At the end of the day these are their areas in which they are trying to place-make. It is all about how much resource and support they are given ultimately as an 'underbelly'. That is where this advisory team can come in and help from a more centralised pool because we are lucky in London that we have the governance arrangements and support mechanisms to do that. There is something around City Hall being more strategic in terms of the support it provides, rather like the English Partnerships' old ATLAS system where big projects were supported by this planning advisory service. London can easily set up a system rather like we have seen in the tri-borough arrangements in certain boroughs. There is no reason why City Hall cannot do that for London as a whole.

If I am asked the exam question of what the Mayor could think about as well, it is how to interrelate better with the Home Counties. As much as we are looking at 300,000 homes and 575,000 jobs in OAs and 8,000 jobs and 3,000 homes in IAs, the bottom line is that we need to think about how that interaction happens across the borders of London and the Home Counties. There is something around the spatial city-region element that we need to think about much more carefully beyond our own subject area today.

Ultimately it is giving the authorities confidence that if they have put their names down to do this that: (a) they are going to get the support and resource that they need; and (b) they will be under the microscope as boroughs to deliver within a given timeframe. If they do not and are not providing the confidence that developers, applicants and funders need, then that is just simply taken off because there are other areas that could afford that deliverability with the limited resources we know the Government has.

James Cleverly AM MP: OK, Stephen.

Stephen Kelly (Assistant Director for Planning, London Borough of Haringey): I am not quite sure which question to answer first. I will tell you why: there is a bit of simplicity that is required.

The most significant thing I would say for the Mayor is mainstream funding into these designations, whether they are OAs or IAs. It does not have to be large sums of money. The thing that makes the difference to existing communities and to capacity and the thing that drives the energy of collaborative working to do stuff is essentially a degree of confidence that, if you are a borough, you can employ one or two people or you can pay for a staff member from the GLA to be seconded into your service to work. Frankly, with the pressure that planning authorities are under at this moment in time, the absence of that security of funding to do stuff is a significant barrier to a lot of successful outcomes.

It does not have to be very large sums of money. This is not a major borough ask. Literally the resource, staff resource and some sense that you could do something - 'superficial' is the wrong word - that raises confidence and that gives a community some sense that it is worth being designated because they are going to get events, activities, and a sense of confidence locally about the future of the place. The Outer London Fund did that quite well. We have an Art Hotel going in at Wood Green. It creates bit of a buzz. Security of funding and the ability then to work with the resources of the GLA becomes far more constructive.

As to the second point, whether there should be something else, outside of this room, the planning halls of boroughs and the GLA nobody really understands the difference between an IA and an OA. Certainly communities have no idea, quite rightly, because it is a totally artificial construct. What we are trying to say in a plan is, "This is a place where everyone is going to work together to change or to do something constructive or to go grow". We are debating whether or not Wood Green should be an IA or an OA. What is the difference? We want Wood Green to be a thriving, successful place in which not just regeneration - whatever that means - happens but the town centre is more successful and jobs sit alongside homes. I suspect we maybe 'over-technicalised' what is essentially a line that needs to be drawn around the place that says everyone is going to work together to make this better.

Some funding and some simplicity around that point may well find that communities which say, "Good, we are only an IA and so we only need 1,000 homes" - as that is the limit - going, "Well, it does not really matter. How many homes can we get out of this?" Wood Green is 1,000 homes. On our site allocations we have allocated about 5,000 homes for Wood Green as a location, which makes it an OA. That is on our current Local Plan. However, it is an IA. There is an anomaly to these different designations. I would say to the new Mayor, "Can you call them something else, please? If it is an area where you want things to happen, just say that rather than try to create designations", because I am not sure it makes a lot of difference outside of here.

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): If you look at housing numbers - and Faraz [Baber] has launched a report on this recently for London First - London needs 50,000 units a year. It is delivering less than half of that. My view is that the next Mayor will be judged on his or her success in increasing the level of supply to nearer the 50,000 mark. What we have now clearly is not working in delivering anything like what London needs.

In terms of what they need to do, clearly they need to look at the prioritisation of the existing group of OAs and IAs for the next London Plan. Some OAs are not delivering and some of the IAs are not delivering in the way that was originally envisaged. You have to question whether you continue along that route. Equally, the other way of looking at it, there are many more areas that could be considered as OAs. The Golden Mile in Hounslow is a good example of that where there is a significant appetite for growth. They could do with a planning framework to help stimulate that growth. Similarly, you could have a lot more IAs. You have a rump of seven left from the original 14. You could have a lot more than that.

Another challenge for the Mayor - whoever they are - is how much they intervene in the planning process. You have the designation of these zones and you also have the big interventionist process of the MDC. MDCs are very important but very expensive to run and set up. There is going to be an interesting debate within the new Planning and Housing Bill as to whether there is a MDC-light type arrangement where you do not need all the bells and whistles of a new functional body but you have greater control of the planning process to stimulate this growth. Also, bring TfL more in to the table in terms of bringing the investment in and the infrastructure to enable that growth to happen as well.

You have a fundamental challenge for the next Mayor about housing supply. They will be judged on how successful they are at increasing it. What we do in OAs is key, but also how interventionist the new Mayor is going to be will be key. Clearly that is an issue for them to decide in the future.

James Cleverly AM MP: To sum up particularly on the points that Steve [Kelly] and Alex made, what I am hearing is - if you are reflecting the feeling out there - that there are these hard steps from one to another rather than a fluid passage from an IA at one end of the spectrum to an MDC at the other. We are artificially segregating or differentiating between what could and should be a much more natural progression from the modest scale through the big ticket and all points in between, rather just say, "It is either that or that or that", and that is it. Would that be a fair summation?

Alex Williams (Director of Borough Planning, TfL): Yes. There is, potentially, another step. The MDC is the complete control interventionist arena. Below that you have the OA, which is a much softer planning framework. I am saying there is another step between those two scenarios that may well need to be considered.

In the 1980s in Covent Garden, an area where there was development tension between Westminster City Council and the London Borough of Camden, there was a form of MDC-light structure. It developed the planning area action plan and took over the planning authority players to oversee the development of that area through a significant amount of change. It is really whether you need that kind of weapon in your armoury to help unlock more supply rather than just going straight for the big MDC.

James Cleverly AM MP: OK, thank you.

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman): That is the end of our questioning. Can I thank our guests very much indeed for their time this morning and their answers?