

MEETING NOTE

Meeting Name: Planning Obligations Advisory Group

Date: 21 May 2019

Time: 14:00 to 15:30

Location: OPDC, 169 Union Street, SE1 0LL

| Attendees | |
|--|--|
| Tom Cardis, OPDC (Chair) Ben Martin, OPDC Peter Farnham, OPDC Katie Hunter, OPDC Kevin Twomey, OPDC Eleanor Fawcett, OPDC | Matt Butler, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Javaid Ashraf, London Borough of Brent |

| Apologies | |
|--|--|
| Jasbir Sandhu, OPDC Clare Healy, OPDC David Scourfield, London Borough of Ealing | |

| Item | Action/ Note | Owner |
|--|---|-------------|
| Introductions | | |
| 1 | Introductions were given. | |
| Agree minutes of previous meeting | | |
| 2 | <p>TC took the group through minutes of the previous meeting of the POAG on 19 February 2019. The minutes were agreed by the group.</p> <p>BM noted that officers are seeking to finalise arrangements for how the Lakeside Drive CPZ consultation spend agreed at the previous meeting may be transferred from OPDC to the London Borough of Brent. BM and JA agreed that they would discuss the issue following the meeting. JA noted Brent's guidance notes on Brent's procedure for how spend proposals are signed off.</p> <p>JA queried the timescales for implementing the CPZ. BM noted that first occupation of First Central is expected next year and emphasised the importance of consulting on and, if supported, implementing the CPZ in advance of this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: BM/JA to progress following the meeting Action: JA to send ODPC Brent's guidance notes on the signing off procedure for S106 projects and will speak to highways about signing off the CPZ consultation. | BM/JA JA |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------|
| | <p>MB queried where OPDC's procedure for approving Section 106 spent is set out. TC clarified that this is set out in Board paper which established the POAG, and also set out in the Terms of Reference for the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: KT to send MB the POAGs Terms of Reference and Board paper. | OPDC |
| Overview of OPDC's "In the Making" programme of initiatives | | |
| 3 | <p>EF game a presentation outlining OPDC's "In the Making" programme of early activation initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Meeting presentations to be circulated following meeting. <p>EF set out the background to the programme and provided an overview of five of the "first wave" projects to be delivered up to 2021 through £2.15 million in committed funding. EF noted that projects have not been randomly identified but have been tactically planned to help foster place making in line with early development of the area.</p> <p>JA queried if there's scope for the projects to change and evolve. EF confirmed that there was, and this was already occurring with some projects.</p> <p>JA queried if there had been formal consultation on the projects. EF noted that in some cases there had been, citing the example of Wormwood Scrubs project. However OPDC have been mindful of not consulting too much prior to securing funding so as to avoid indications that projects were definitely going ahead.</p> <p>JA highlighted the potential for CIL and NCIL in addition to Section 106 to assist in project funding, and the opportunities projects such as these present for cross borough working on joint funding for projects. JA also noted the benefit in having a programme of projects identified and costed when negotiating S106 contributions.</p> <p>MB queried how match funding for Wormwood Scrubs projects will be utilised, and if it may be used to fund projects identified through the masterplan work LBHF are leading on for the scrubs. EF clarified that match funding would be used, but this would be focused at projects centred on entry points to the Scrubs.</p> <p>MB queried the process of identifying the five projects selected as part of the first wave, and how the local authorities were consulted in the selection process. EF clarified that this wasn't an indication that they were prioritised, and that factors such as timing and constraints meant some projects can't be forward in the initial phase – the deliverability of projects had been informed by discussions with relevant local authority colleagues. TC noted that other funding opportunities have already been identified to help bring these projects forward.</p> | KT |
| Overview of OPDC's Liveable Neighbourhood and Future High Streets Bids | | |
| 4 | <p>TC provided a presentation on OPDC's funding bids for the Liveable Neighbourhood Fund and Future High Street Fund.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>The Liveable Neighbourhood Fund bid focused on improvements to the Park Royal Centre junction, along with walking and cycling enhancements along the Park Royal “Big X”. Non-TfL matching will need to form part of the funding strategy. The deadline for submitting the bid is November 2019</p> <p>The Future High Street fund bid was submitted by the London Borough of Ealing on behalf of OPDC. The bid focuses on a potential meanwhile workspace hub on part of the ASDA car park in Park Royal centre. It has since been confirmed that LB Ealing and OPDC were unsuccessful in their bid.</p> | |
| Planning Obligations SPD Consultation – Summary of Key Issues | | |
| 5 | <p>KT provided a summary of the main issues highlighted as part of the public consultation on OPDC’s Planning Obligations SPD in January/February 2019.</p> <p>MB queried what progress has been made on OPDC’s CIL strategy. BM clarified that OPDC are currently receiving legal advice on the new CIL regulations and their impact, and plan to brief Planning Committee and Board on a preferred approach, which should be established over the summer. JA agreed with OPDC’s approach of progressing the SPD in advance of the CIL strategy, and the certainty it provides.</p> <p>Design Monitoring contribution: KT highlighted that the inspector of OPDC’s Local Plan has sought removal of this obligation in Policy D1, but officers feel that there is still a basis for retaining this obligation in the SPD. MB noted that LBHF utilise the obligation on their large schemes.</p> <p>Late stage reviews on schemes that meet the threshold approach: MB noted the benefit in retaining this requirement as a starting point for negotiation.</p> <p>KT noted timelines for finalising the SPD, and that the SPD will be adopted following adoption of OPDC’s Local Plan in Winter 19/20. MB queried if the timelines for Local Plan adoption were now established. PF noted that it’s currently envisioned that the Plan would be brought Board for adoption in November 2019.</p> | |
| Schedule of S106 Contributions | | |
| 6 | <p>TC presented the schedule of s106 contributions. KT noted that there were no new committed schemes or payments received since the previous meeting of the group.</p> <p>JA noted that Brent would be eager to work with OPDC on identifying projects where Brent’s S106 and CIL funding could be utilised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: JA to provide details of potential S106/CIL funding streams • Action: OPDC to provide list of projects where funding could be directed <p>MB noted that the majority of LBHFs contributions relate to development in White City, with little potential for spend on projects in the OPDC area.</p> <p>MB noted that there is a need to agree how education contributions from the Oaklands S106 would be spent. LBHF are progressing a Schools Strategy to inform priorities for spend. It was agreed that OPDC would liaise with LBHF officers on the strategy and</p> | <p>JA ODPC</p> |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>potential for future spend proposals to be brought to the POAG. It was also agreed that a focused session would be held on education contributions at the next POAG meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Next meeting will have a focused agenda item on education contributions and spend. • Action: OPDC officers to liaise with LBHF on schools strategy. <p>JA recommended that the schedule should highlight expiry date of contributions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Schedule to be amended. <p>MB queried if OPDC have repayment clauses in S106 agreements. BM noted that they typically don't, unless this is something that applicants themselves push strongly for.</p> | <p>OPDC</p> <p>OPDC</p> <p>ODPC</p> |
| AOB | | |
| 7 | <p>Ways working protocol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BM noted that comments due on draft for 28th May <p>Information sharing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JA suggested that the group explore opportunities for joint learning opportunities and sharing ways of working, citing the benefits of building trust and partnership working across authorities. <p>Next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was agreed that the next meeting of the PAOG would be held in early September. | |