

MEETING NOTE

Meeting Name: Planning Obligations Advisory Group

Date: 18 September 2019

Time: 10:00 to 11:30

Location: OPDC, 169 Union Street, SE1 0LL

Attendees	
Tom Cardis, OPDC (Chair) Ben Martin, OPDC Katie Hunter, OPDC Jasbir Sandhu, OPDC Clare Healy, OPDC Megan Collins, OPDC Kevin Twomey, OPDC	Matt Paterson, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Kevin Gordan, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Ciara Whelehan, London Borough of Brent

Apologies	
Peter Farnham, OPDC David Scourfield, London Borough of Ealing	

Item	Action/ Note	Owner
Introductions		
1	Introductions were given.	
Agree minutes of previous meeting		
2	Actions carried forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: KT to send MP the PAOG's Terms of Reference Action: Brent to send OPDC guidance notes on S106 signing off procedure (Since completed) Action: OPDC/Brent to share details of S106/CIL funding streams and projects where funding could be directed 	KT CW OPDC/ Brent
Education contributions		
3	TC gave presentation on the context of education contributions in the OPDC area. This included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An overview OPDC's Social Infrastructure Needs Study (SINS) - An overview of OPDC's Local Plan, IDP and Planning Obligations SPD with regards to education provision and contributions - The current schedule of education contributions and conditions/spend radiuses. KG set out the issues in LBHF with regards to schools capacity. Since the SINS, the surplus capacity has grown at both a primary and secondary school level. This	

	<p>surplus is becoming established following a sharp fall in the school role for the current academic year and is set to continue dropping as results of demographic changes, even allowing for development pipeline.</p> <p>KG noted that it's not possible to maintain a surplus at primary level, and some schools have a PAN reduction in place, which has a major impact on financial viability of schools continuing to operate.</p> <p>In terms of potential spend opportunities, KG highlighted 3 avenues LBHF would be eager to fund via S106 monies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintenance funding for schools to assist with maintenance funding backlog; - Financial support for schools with viability issues due to declining intake; - Funding for a marketing strategy to promote schools in the borough. <p>It was noted that conditions attached to current S106 agreement agreements would likely support any improvement works, and there may be difficulties with funding operating budgets. Conditions are not likely to support funding for marketing strategy.</p> <p>KG cited Old Oak primary school as an example of a school with PAN reduction. In the case of that school, the funding would be used to ensure the school remains open, which would be necessary to support development occurring in Old Oak. It was acknowledged that good schools add significant value new development.</p> <p>TC noted that following the Local Plan examination, OPDC would be likely to be updating the SINS study and that in so doing, it would be useful to capture the updated position on surplus capacity. given the new scenarios being faced that it may be appropriate to update the SINS study. This was broadly agreed, with KG noting that LBHF now have further clarity on they intend to address issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: OPDC to engage with education colleagues in the development of the updated SINS <p>TC queried if going forward, the same level of financial contributions should be secured through S106 towards educational facilities. The current level of education contributions far exceeds those secured for other areas including health and transport. BM noted that in many cases, securing contributions to improved connections to existing schools with capacity would be more beneficial, particularly along Scrubs Lane where a number of schemes have been approved. Attendees noted that there may be benefit in drafting a S106 clause template that could allow for educational contributions to contribute to enhancing routes to schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: OPDC to draft an updated education contributions S106 template and circulate this for comment to the Local Authorities <p>MP noted that if the strategy for schools is centred on improvement/supporting, then that does allow room for maximising other priorities, but expressed concern at revisiting DIFS and potentially securing no education contributions. BM noted that the current approach is based on the GLA's Child Yield Calculator and the relevant boroughs expansion costs per pupil.</p>	<p>OPDC</p> <p>OPDC</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------

	<p>CW noted that Brent have undertaken an assessment as part of the IDP for their draft Local Plan. While sufficient capacity exists at early years, there is a need identified for new primary and secondary schools/capacity. The demand has been identified more so in the North of the borough. CW noted that she would need to consult with colleagues on potential projects which fall within spend radiuses for OPDC's S106.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: CW to consult with education colleagues <p>TC noted the potential for cross boundary spend, given the radiuses of the various S106 agreements. CW noted that thought should be given to how this would be reflected in Infrastructure Funding Statements.</p> <p>TC queried whether CIL may be a better way of funding education rather than S106. Officers from LBHF and Brent suggested they find S106 more beneficial as it provides more certainty on funding for/delivering education facilities, particularly for larger schemes.</p> <p>MC suggested that it would be helpful for OPDC if boroughs were to identify the specific schools which would benefit from the suggested interventions, both in terms of education contributions and wider strategy for focusing infrastructure spend. KG agreed and committed to providing a bulletin with a list of school names with details of roll trajectory, budget/maintenance backlog and other key issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: LBHF to provide details of priority schools within LBHF • Action: OPDC to assess against and reintroduce item at next POAG meeting <p>The need for Ealing's input on potential spend priorities was noted, particularly given large funding pot available from First Central.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: OPDC to contact Ealing on questions raised in the discussion. <p>BM queried the details of LBHF's proposed marketing strategy for schools. KG noted that some work had been undertaken with consultants, and that the focus would be on good teaching, school environment, head teacher, proximity/connectivity and Ofsted results.</p>	<p>CW</p> <p>KG OPDC</p> <p>OPDC</p>
Legible London management and maintenance		
4	<p>CH presented details of OPDC's wayfinding strategy. The strategy was produced with input from the three host boroughs and RBKC and identified locations for TFL products in and around the OPDC area. In producing the strategy, concern was expressed by local authorities at costs for ongoing management and maintenance of Legible London signage, as well as the need to capture funding for up front costs of the signage. The need for the funding to be ring fenced was also expressed.</p> <p>OPDC's suggested approach to addressing these concerns is to seek an open agreement from POAG to approve spend on maintenance for Legible London signage from S106 contributions secured for this purpose. In terms of managing funds, it is proposed that OPDC would hold a central ring fenced fund for maintenance spend and</p>	

	<p>notify boroughs of what the annual budget would be for each borough. Budgets would likely be allocated on the basis of the value of Legible London signage within each borough. The expectation would be that boroughs would plan their spend based on this budget, report evidence of spend to OPDC who would then reimburse on an annual basis.</p> <p>The next step is to discuss further details of this approach with TfL and borough transport officers, but OPDC are seeking in principle agreement from POAG for the strategy.</p> <p>Once the actual process is agreed with borough transports officers, it would be brought back to the POAG group with a formalised proposal for agreement.</p> <p>The POAG agreed that the strategy should go forward for further discussion with borough transport officers.</p> <p>MP queried if the need for an open agreement on maintenance spend is likely to apply to other areas such as open space maintenance, and if so, a consistent approach should be put in place. OPDC officers agreed this may arise and other circumstances and said they will assess where this may the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: OPDC to assess other circumstance where an open agreement on maintenance funds may be required. • Action: OPDC to present an item at a future POAG meeting to agree 	<p>OPDC</p> <p>OPDC</p>
Schedule of S106 Contributions		
5	<p>TC took the group through the schedule of S106 contributions, and noted that it would be good for all to review and identify opportunities for future spend proposals.</p> <p>KG queried the approach for seeking S106 funding. It was clarified that the process as set out in the groups terms of reference is that a S106 Spend Proposal is brought to the POAG, who then make a recommendation to OPDC's CFO who makes a final decision. OPDC will circulate the SSP template, and Terms of Reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: OPDC to circulate POAG Terms or Reference and SSP template <p>KG queried the relationship between the borough in which a development is located and spend radiuses for certain obligations. TC clarified that due to the cross boundary nature of OPDC, spend radiuses are needed as contributions from development in one borough may need to be spent in another, which was part of rationale for establishing the POAG to approve spend decisions.</p> <p>KG noted that he would be aim to bring a spend proposal for education spend in LBHF to the next meeting of the group.</p>	<p>KT</p>
AOB		
7	<p>Agenda items for the next meeting of the POAG were noted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Return to education contributions. - Possible SSP from LBHF on education spend. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Process/mechanism for drawing down money from OPDC following approval of spend.- Possible SSP for health contributions at Central Middlesex Hospital. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Action: Include agenda items for meeting of the POAG	KT
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------