

MEETING NOTE

Meeting Name: Planning Obligations Advisory Group Date: 15 July 2020

Date: 15 July 2020 Time: 14:00 to 15:30

Location: MS Teams Meeting

Attendees Roz Johnson (RJ), OPDC (Chair) Tom Cardis (TC), OPDC Fiona Marsh (FM), OPDC Clare Healy (CH), OPDC Kevin Twomey (KT), OPDC	Grace Williams (GW), OPDC Matt Patterson (MP), LB of Hammersmith and Fulham Javaid Ashraf (JA), LB of Brent
Apologies David Scourfield (LB of Ealing)	

Item	Action/ Note	Owner
Introductions		
1	Introductions were given.	
Agree minutes of previous meeting		
2	Minutes were agreed	
	Actions to be carried forward:	
	 Education contributions and funding Education S106 spend to be carried forward to future meetings. 	OPDC
	Education 6 100 spend to be carried forward to retain meetings.	0.20
S106	Spend Proposal – Wayfinding Implementation	
3	Grace Williams, Great Place Scheme Manager at OPDC, took the group through the spend proposal to improve wayfinding across Old Oak and Park Royal via a series of Legible London fingerposts and liths, as well as by commissioning a creative wayfinding initiative to aid legibility.	
	CH queried the types of signage to be delivered and what their location would be. CH also noted that an approach for the management and maintenance of Legible London signage has been agreed with boroughs and TfL and would in future be distributed to the three boroughs. GW noted that the details of specific locations and types of signage has	



not yet been determined, but would be guided by OPDC's wayfinding strategy, completed in conjunction with the three host boroughs. Provision for the maintenance of signage has been factored for within the budget, and so maintenance funds will not be diverted for capital costs.

TC noted the conditions of the Oaklands specifically referenced lighting of Old Oak Common Lane Bridge. GW noted that this has been assessed, but that it's very challenging to deliver a lighting project within a budget set by this contribution, and that signage and wayfinding would be a more effective use of the funds.

MP queried whether the individual projects would be delivered in locations which would be subject to wider improvements through redevelopment in future, and so potentially just short term in nature. GW clarified that the projects are intended to be delivered in areas which are either being improved, or have already been improved. TC added that projects will be delivered in coordination with works developers are undertaking where appropriate.

The group unanimously agreed to recommend the spend proposals for approval.

OPDC

Action: SSP to be taken to the CFO for approval

S106 Spend Proposal – Wesley Playing Fields

GW took the group through the spend proposal for Wesley Playing Fields, which seeks funding for improvements and expansion of play infrastructure.

TC noted that that conditions of the S106 contributions were very specific in terms of improvements to play space at Wesley Playing Fields, with no scope for it be redirected elsewhere.

MP queried whether there had been engagement with officers form LB Ealing on this project. GW clarified that Jan Ackenhausen, project lead, has had discussions with the design team at Ealing and that they are keen to work with OPDC in delivering the project. GW cited a similar project underway at Cerebos Gardens which Ealing also had involvement in.

The group unanimously agreed to recommend the spend proposals for approval.

• **Action:** SSP to be taken to the CFO for approval

OPDC

Procedure for the drawing down of planning contributions from OPDC

KT provided an update on OPDC proposed procedure for the drawing down of S106 planning contributions. The issue was discussed at a previous meeting of the group in December, and a paper was circulated ahead of the March meeting which was subsequently cancelled.

Since March, OPDC have reviewed the proposed procedure as set out in March's paper. It is still proposed that the default position would be for delivery agents to fund projects



upfront and claim this money retrospectively from OPDC upon proof of expenditure and project delivery. However, flexibility will be provided on a case by case based where it is demonstrated that there is a need for a transfer of S106 monies prior to a project commencing. Where this is the case, OPDC would require grant agreement with the delivery agent with requirements for monitoring and reporting of spend.

MP queried if there could be potential for phased payments. FM agreed the procedures should be able to cater for this approach where necessary.

JA noted that Brent utilise a variety of mechanisms, including requirements for ongoing monitoring of project progress within grant agreements. He also noted that letters of comfort have been used to provide security on the use of S106 monies by delivery agents.

 Action: Paper on new procedure to be brought to the next POAG meeting for agreement **OPDC**

Schedule of S106 Contributions

6 KT provided an overview Schedule of S106 Contributions.

KT noted recent discussions with TfL regarding the Park Royal Footbridge contribution of £1.5 million. It is hoped that a spend proposal will be brought to the next group meeting.

TC noted that some contributions had been earmarked as match funding as part of OPDC's Park Royal Liveable Neighbourhoods Fund Bid. That programme has been paused by TfL in light of their budgetary issues arising from Covid-19, and so there's likely to be a pause on any proposals relating to those contributions.

JA queried how the lead/delivery organisation for projects arising from various contributions are identified, particularly as many relate to highways issues. It was agreed that this detail should be included in the schedule, with discussion at the next POAG meeting identifying appropriate delivery agents. RJ noted that timelines for project delivery would be beneficial in the S106 schedule

Action: S106 schedule to be updated to include project leads and timelines.

TC queried how the boroughs were presenting their IFS documents. It was agreed that a meeting on IFS would be beneficial to share ideas and ensure a consistent approach. It was also agreed that OPDC's draft IFS should be brought to the next POAG meeting for review.

 Action: OPDC to liaise with boroughs on approach to Infrastructure Funding Statements KT

• Action: Draft Infrastructure Funding Statement to be brought to next POAG meeting

KT

AOB

TC provided an update on the revised scheme of delegation for planning applications recently agreed OPDC Board. The revisions will mean greater involvement by OPDC in



negotiating S106 agreements for planning applications which have been delegated to Ealing and Brent, and in approving spend. In future, spend proposals for S106 monies secured through applications in North Acton will need to come before the POAG and be approved by OPDC's CFO.

MP noted impacts on Covid-19 on developer obligations, and the potential for obligations to be reviewed. He also noted the renewed importance of securing offsite obligations on issues to support communities, particularly supporting economic development.

JA noted the need for continuous improvement and learning opportunities between boroughs and OPDC, and that the IFS provides an opportunity to share approaches.