

MEETING NOTE

Meeting Name: Planning Obligations Advisory Group

Date: 19 February 2019

Time: 13:30 to 15:00

Location: OPDC, 169 Union Street, SE1 0LL

Attendees	
Tom Cardis, OPDC (Chair) Doug Wilson, OPDC Ben Martin, OPDC Jasbir Sandhu, OPDC Peter Farnham, OPDC Katie Hunter, OPDC Kevin Twomey, OPDC Jo Baxendale, OPDC	Bethany Lester, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Rob Krzyszowski, London Borough of Brent Brienne Stolper, London Borough of Ealing

Apologies	
Peter O'Dowd, OPDC Simon Weaver, OPDC	

Item	Action/ Note	Owner
Introductions		
1	Introductions were given.	
Agree minutes of previous meeting		
2	TC took the group through minutes of the previous meeting of the POAG from November 22 nd 2018. The minutes were agreed by the group. TC noted that a revised Terms of Reference was circulated in December reflecting comments made at the previous meeting in November. It was agreed that this would now be considered the final version of the Terms of Reference for the group. It was noted that comments made on the Planning Obligations SPD were reflected in consultation version of the document.	
S106 Spend Proposal – Great Place Scheme Projects		
3	JB gave a presentation which outlined the background of OPDC's Great Place Scheme (GPS), the programme of activities planned as part of the GPS, and details of the two	

	<p>projects for which S106 funding was being sought towards as part of this S106 spend proposal.</p> <p>TC drew attention to the role of match funding as part of the GPS funding model. 77% of the programme funding is from National Lottery Funding, with the remainder to be provided by OPDC as match funding, which this spend proposal is set to form part of.</p> <p>RK noted Brent's strong support for the spend proposal and the GPS programme more broadly, and that the S106 Spend Proposal satisfied the terms of the S106 agreement. Links between the GPS and Brent's London Borough of Culture programme were also welcomed.</p> <p>Officers from LBHF and Ealing agreed with these comments and noted support for the spend proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: The SSP, including a summary of the group's discussion, will be taken to OPDC's Chief Operating Officers for a final decision. 	OPDC
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

S106 Spend Proposal – Lakeside Drive CPZ Consultation

4	<p>BM provided an overview of the spend proposal for the Lakeside Drive Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) consultation and referendum.</p> <p>A CPZ would reduce the risk of overspill parking from the First Central scheme at Lakeside Drive. As no on-street parking restrictions are currently in place in the surrounding area, it is necessary to consult and hold a referendum among existing residents on the implementation of the CPZ. This spend proposal seeks funding towards the consultation and referendum process only which would be undertaken by the local highways authority (Brent).</p> <p>BM noted that as part of the S106 agreement, occupants of the First Central development (17/0076/FUMOPDC) would not be permitted to apply for parking permits within the proposed CPZ.</p> <p>RK noted Brent's support for the spend proposal, highlighting that it was necessary to support delivery of car free development. While the highways department at Brent will not have capacity to implement the CPZ until April 2020, the fact that this proposal relates to the consultation/referendum on the CPZ means that Brent will be in a position to spend the monies being sought.</p> <p>BS queried who would be consulted on as part of the consultation. BM noted that it would be up to Brent, as local highways authority, to determine the consultation area, but that the consultation area usually relates just to the proposed CPZ boundary.</p> <p>KH highlighted the negative impact of local residents not supporting the CPZ. Unrestricted parking on Lakeside Drive is likely to lead to an increase in private vehicle use arising from an 807 home development which would lead to worsening air quality and negatively affect the environment for walking and cycling. TC noted that the need for the CPZ would need to be highlighted by Brent as part of the consultation. BM noted that</p>	
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>under either scenario parking would be available on Lakeside Drive and the referendum would only establish whether this parking should be subject to restrictions or not. The potential impact of the CPZ not being established in advance of first occupation of the First Central scheme was also highlighted.</p> <p>Despite concerns about the potential impacts of a negative referendum result it was recognised that the planning obligation is tightly bound for this particular purpose and that not taking the spending proposal forward would not address this concern. There was unanimous support acknowledged for the spend proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: The SSP, including a summary of the groups discussion, will be taken to OPDC's Chief Operating Officer for a final decision. 	OPDC
Protocol for collaborative development management		
5	<p>BM provided an overview of the emerging protocol for collaborative development management between OPDC and three host local authorities, the need for which was agreed at the previous POAG meeting in November. Following initial correspondence by OPDC, LBHF prepared a comprehensive draft protocol for discussion. This was circulated to Brent and Ealing and for comment, with additional comments received by Brent.</p> <p>OPDC provided comments in response to the draft protocol prepared by LBHF and commented on by Brent. BM noted that this should not be thought of as a draft, but as a way of fleshing out the issues raised and to develop an appropriate scope for the protocol. BM also noted that OPDC intend to have one protocol in place, rather than separate protocols for each Borough.</p> <p>RK noted that with regards to section 4 (spending of contributions/post implementation), that the POAG, through the schedule of S106 contributions, is the best platform for such reporting. TC confirmed that a schedule of planning applications is provided for Tri Borough meetings, and that a similar schedule on scheme implementation has been requested by OPDC planning committee.</p> <p>RK noted that Brent development management officers were satisfied with a draft protocol, subject to suggested changes in the track changed version.</p> <p>BL welcomed development of the protocol but noted that it was important that it needed to be flexible. It was broadly agreed that the protocol would be better based on a series of principles rather than setting out detailed processes.</p> <p>BM cited the need to account for LBHF taking OPDC schemes to their planning committee, but Brent and Ealing not doing so. While this can be programmed for in cases where pre app discussions have taken place and OPDC are aware an application is due for submission, it may not be possible where an application is submitted without advance notice. It was agreed flexibility would be needed in such circumstances for an alternative process within LBHF to brief committee members of planning applications.</p> <p>BL noted that LBHF support many of the changes suggested by OPDC to the protocol, in particular for officer level meetings at pre and post application stage without the applicant</p>	

	<p>present. LBHF have further suggested track changes to the version circulated prior to the meeting and will issue these to OPDC in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: OPDC to work the paper up into a draft protocol and circulate to the local authorities for comment <p>It was agreed that a dedicated meeting between OPDC and borough officers would be organised to discuss the emerging protocol. BM noted the need to have development management input as part of this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: BM to organise meeting on the draft protocol with borough DM officers. 	<p>LBHF</p> <p>OPDC</p>
Schedule of S106 Contributions		
6	<p>TC presented the schedule of s106 contributions, noting that this was a draft structure and that comments were welcomed on how it is presented. It was noted that a map of the schemes listed would be included as part of the future schedules.</p> <p>TC provided an overview of the schemes outlined in the schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Oaklands and First Central schemes are commenced and form the current pot of S106 contributions. Mitre Yard – it is understood that an amended scheme providing additional units is set to come forward, though no timescales are yet known. North Kensington Gate (North and South): No progress on site, and it is understood the landowner may be looking to sell. Land East of Victoria Centre: An application for a revised conventional residential scheme was submitted before Christmas and set to be considered by April Planning Committee 2 Scrubs Lane: Pre apps were held last year on a Section 73 application, however no progress made as of late. 19 Abbey Road: Progress unknown A planning application has been submitted for a mixed hotel and industrial proposal at Western Avenue. <p>BM noted that once there is a sufficient number of committed s106 agreements, there would be an opportunity to hold dedicated sessions on different topic areas, particularly education. BL agreed, citing the spending radius for the Oaklands schemes. TC noted that it may help identify potential funding for projects that boroughs are seeking to bring forward outside of the OPDC area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: Education contributions to be added as future POAG agenda item 	<p>OPDC</p>
AOB		
7	<p>Planning Obligations SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation is open until Friday 22nd February. No substantial issues raised to report on so far. Overview of consultation response and next steps can be provided at the next POAG meeting. <p>Environmental SPD event</p>	

