

Fourth Session: Outer London Commission Minutes – Waltham Forest 24th February 2015

Attendance:

OLC Members

Will Mckee	Chair	WM
Corraine Swaine	Arup	CS (A)
Keith Mitchell	Peter Brett	KM
Colin Stanbridge	London Chambers of Commerce	CS (CofC)

Non – OLC Members

John Lett	GLA	JL
Rachael Rooney	GLA	RR
Josephine Vos	TfL	JV
Alex Williams	TfL	AW
David Morris	Enfield	DM
Charlotte May	Waltham Forest	CM

1. Welcome and Introductions

WM welcomed everyone

2. Process for Fourth round of OLC

WM explained that the fourth round would be split into 2 sessions, one initially focussing on residential parking which would immediately inform a Minor Alteration to the London Plan (MALP), and the second session exploring a range of other issues that JL would go through later in the meeting.

For the first session on parking, following on from the first Commission's meeting which was held in December 2014, there is now a series of meetings being held around London, which this is the first, to gain the views of wider outer London stakeholders. There will be a final Commission meeting in mid / late March and report setting out the Commission's recommendations published in May to coincide with consultation on MALP.

3. Specific Discussion Point: Parking Review

TfL presented the issues arising from the review – see attachment for slides.

One of the boroughs said that they would want to keep maximum standards as they work well in the borough and seem to work well for developers as well. They also stated they do not want to see in the introduction of minimums in the Plan.

The borough is varied: north of the North Circular is quite different to south of it. They look inwards towards London and there is development pressure towards London.

The borough is a mini Holland and has aspirations to increase cycling and walking, there is also a trend towards declining car ownership. It is a popular borough for young people who can't afford inner London. There is not such an emphasis on car ownership and many are more likely/inclined to belong to car clubs. There is also a concern that more spaces will lead to less space for other amenity assets. Impacts on health, air quality, quality of life and liveability should also be considered. Parking would take the place of other land uses. Even with variation of PTALs, CPZs, etc. the borough finds maximums useful.

The Chair asked whether the boroughs saw their boroughs as having different typologies.

The other borough said that they mirror what the other borough had said in terms of the current policy usefulness and explained that the demography of the borough was very varied and would like the status quo.

GLA asked whether there would be any appetite for more relaxation in the policy for PTAL 2 or if there was a need to mention visitor parking.

One of the boroughs thought there was already enough flexibility in PTAL 2. Again they emphasised that their priorities for amenity and other uses over parking spaces. They also thought there was a reference to visitor parking and it did not cause them difficulties.

The Chair asked whether the boroughs recognised any of the issues set out in the presentation.

One borough explained that they did get some emails from residents who complained about a lack of parking but not many. They thought the current policy approach struck the right balance. Air quality is a major issue – the whole borough is an air quality management area – and residents are concerned about associated health implications. Also, if origin parking is increased you are storing up problems with destination parking. It's not a solution. They re-emphasized the importance of their policy priorities, including amenity space, housing delivery and other land uses.

One of the boroughs explained how they are trying to get a real modal shift/behaviour change.

One of the Commissioners asked whether the terminology in the policy options was correct – 'suburban areas / family housing', especially in the context of the demographic changes that have been discussed.

One borough explained that there are targets to decrease the car modal share by 5% -8% by and increase cycling to 10% of journeys by 2020.

One of the boroughs said that anecdotally it has been noticed that there are a lot more people from Eastern Europe, who typically have more than one car per family and it is often the case that there are more than one family on each house – therefore there can be up to 4 or 5 cars per house in some places.

The other borough pointed out that the priority is for outdoor space for denser developments rather than parking spaces. They also pointed out that developers do not necessarily challenge this.

It was also pointed out by one of the Commissioners that developers also question the viability of schemes in providing more spaces. It was also asked whether or not outer London is changing and becoming more like inner London, citing the example of Chiswick.

There was then a discussion on typologies and whether parts of boroughs represent different characteristics.

One of the boroughs explained that what is considered 'inner London' is going outwards – the north circular now provides a divider between inner and outer London.

Another borough concurred and suggested that even beyond the North Circular there are some inner London characteristics. Additionally, it was suggested that a change to policy would be regressive and harmful.

The Chair then summarised the boroughs' responses – Current residential parking standards not a problem as perceived by Government and that changes to policies might actually be harmful to other priorities and objectives of the boroughs – issues such as air quality, walking /cycling objectives, land take of increased parking provision etc.

TfL asked the boroughs' opinion on minimum standards.

One borough said they wouldn't want to see the introduction of minimum standards and highlighted that in the USA the use of minimum standards have led to over provision of spaces – they wouldn't want to force developers to provide more than they want to – current policy allows for market led provision and local policy priorities to be taken into account.

The Chair asked whether it was therefore fair to say that the boroughs wanted to keep the status quo – the boroughs then agreed with this suggestion.

The Commission then asked whether keeping the same policy was an option or has it been taken out of the discussion.

The Chair confirmed that no, it hadn't been taken out – it was for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Mayor based on views of stakeholders in outer London and any evidence available.

The Chair then asked the boroughs whether they thought they were typical of their neighbours.

TfL responded – Waltham Forest and Enfield are quite like Haringey and Redbridge but very different from Barnet.

4. Outline of other issues for discussion in 2015

JL explained that later in 2015 the OLC would meet again to discuss a range of other issues of importance to outer London – the outcome of which would feed into the full review of the London Plan. These are summarised as follows:

Removing Barriers to Housing Delivery
Distinct outer London dimension e.g

- Density

- Viability
- Affordable rent / intermediate housing
- New built forms, existing character
- PTAL
- Local policy constraints

Crossrail and Land Release

Crossrail 1

- What other station related development potential could be realised?
- Ongoing work to be made available to the Commission

Crossrail 2

- What are the alignment options?
- Where could the stations be?
- What is the land use / density patterns around the stations?
- What is the potential for capacity uplift in terms of housing, town centre uses, businesses?
- What are the negative implications for such changes?

Land use priorities: Economy versus Housing

Emerging “Big Issue” – what is the right balance for a post industrial city?

- Offices to Residential / Industrial to Residential /
- Town Centres to Residential
- Eg industrial release C3 times 37 ha per annum benchmark
- New supply research to inform the Commission / Demand side assessment to follow
- What are the implications for this in terms of services for the city, output, productivity, employment?

Release of land for town centre intensification

Building on previous recommendations eg FALP policy 2.15

- Are there “volunteers” for town centre renewal?
- Are these geographically representative?
- How can they be developed as exemplars for wider applications?
- What sort of projects are required for these?

New approaches to regional co-ordination

Major EiP issue for London and wider South East

- Wider South East perspective - regional summit, wider south east Commission?
- Initial thoughts – 2050 Infrastructure Plan
- MDAG – Design responses
- OLC – London perspective - cross border arrangements - eg industrial and retail provision, parking, logistics, waste, migration flows, SMHAs, Duty to Co-operate
- OLC, MDAG, Wider SE Commission all to report by end of 2015 on more effective arrangements for coordinating strategic policy and investment across the wider SE

5. Next steps

There are 2 other sub regional meetings being held in early March.

A final Commission meeting would be held at the end of March to discuss the sub regional meetings and prepare recommendations for the final report to the Mayor.

The final report would then be published alongside the consultation of any minor alteration of the London Plan post the general election.

6. Any Other Business

7. Date of next meeting

The next meeting is on Tuesday 3rd March at Brent Civic Centre.