
OLYMPIC PARK LEGACY CORPORATION

Statement by the Mayor of London following public
consultation

MAYOR OF LONDON

COPYRIGHT

**Greater London Authority
October 2011**

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk
enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458
ISBN 978-1-84781-462-3
Copies of this report are available
from www.london.gov.uk

CONTENTS

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2	STATEMENT BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON	6
	Introduction	7
	Purpose of this statement	7
	Summary of responses and Mayor’s consideration	8
	Response from the London Assembly	18
	The Mayor’s latest proposals	20
	Next steps	23

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Between February and April 2011, the Mayor of London published his proposals to establish a Mayoral development corporation (MDC) covering the Olympic Park and surrounding area, using powers that he expects to be granted by the Localism Bill currently before Parliament. This initiated a period of consultation on those proposals in accordance with the consultation provisions in the Bill. This statement describes the Mayor's latest proposals and thinking with respect to what would be the new Olympic Park Legacy Corporation ('the Corporation'), following his consideration of responses to the consultation, and sets out the process required to give effect to those proposals.
2. The Mayor's consultation document focused on seven key questions. On each of these questions, the Mayor's latest proposals take account of issues raised during consultation:

QUESTION 1: Do you agree that the designation of a Mayoral development area, and creation of a Mayoral development corporation, is the most effective way to meet the Mayor's objectives? If not, what arrangements would you propose instead?

A very large majority of respondents – including all the statutory consultees that responded – accept and support the case for an MDC in the area, and the Mayor remains convinced that an MDC is the best option for delivering his objectives.

QUESTION 2: Does the proposed purpose of the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation correctly address the Mayor's objectives as described in this document? If not, how should it be changed?

Again, the majority of respondents were content with the proposed purpose for the Corporation, and while some respondents were keen to see more detail set out in the purpose, the Mayor does not believe this is necessary or appropriate. The Mayor therefore remains of the view that the purpose of the Corporation should be as proposed in his consultation document:

"To promote and deliver physical, social, economic and environmental regeneration in the Olympic Park and surrounding area, in particular by maximising the legacy of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, by securing high-quality sustainable development and investment, ensuring the long-term success of the facilities and assets within its direct control and supporting and promoting the aim of convergence."

QUESTION 3: Does the proposed boundary offer the best opportunity to achieve the objectives set out in this document? Should any area be omitted? Should any other areas be considered for inclusion?

There was no significant objection to the criteria proposed by the Mayor for deciding how the Corporation's boundary should be drawn, nor were there any significant objections to including those areas proposed for inclusion. Some respondents proposed that specific additional areas should be included to the north-east and south-east. While the Mayor agrees that there are neighbouring areas with significant potential for regeneration and growth, he is not convinced that they meet the requirement that their success is genuinely interdependent with that of the Park itself. Nor is the Mayor minded to agree with the respondents who proposed that the Corporation cover a much wider area encompassing a much larger proportion of the growth and regeneration potential in north-east London, as this would dilute the attention and resources of the Corporation so much as to jeopardise its core purpose.

The Mayor therefore proposes that the boundary remain as set out in his consultation document, subject to the correction of some minor discrepancies between the two maps issued during the consultation.

QUESTION 4: In order to meet the objectives set out in this document, do you agree that the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation should take the full range of planning functions? If not, what other arrangements could be put into place to ensure a single, integrated and consistent planning framework for the area?

The large majority of respondents agree that the Corporation should have development control powers. However, opinion was divided on whether the Corporation should have plan-making powers: almost all the local landowners and developers who responded were in favour of the Corporation having these powers, as were the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) and London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), which currently have development control powers in the area. However, all but one of the affected local authorities opposed this move.

While the Mayor understands the concerns of the local authorities and others about the Corporation taking plan-making powers, none of those objecting to the move proposed an alternative which would enable the Mayor to meet his two objectives: to avoid the risks of inconsistent planning policies in respect of four different authorities; and the Corporation taking a central role in administering the Community Infrastructure Levy for the area inside its boundary. Given the importance placed by the Mayor on these objectives, he remains convinced that the Corporation should take plan-making powers as well as development control powers.

QUESTION 5: In order to meet the objectives set out in this document, do you agree that the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation should exercise its planning functions in the way proposed? If not, what alternative arrangements would you propose, and why?

Respondents expressed a variety of opinions on this topic, most notably in three particular areas: on the relative merits of the Corporation commissioning the preparation of planning reports from (and passing planning fees to) local authorities, as the LTGDC planning authority does, compared to keeping this work (and the fees) in-house, as the ODA planning authority does; on the composition of the Corporation's planning committee; and on the way in which the Corporation should raise and invest Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Mayor notes these diverse opinions, but believes that these are all primarily matters for the Corporation to determine itself. Therefore, at the present time he is not inclined to take a definitive view, nor to pre-empt the Corporation's own consideration of these matters, although he has some initial views on these subjects and expects to be consulted by the Corporation on all these matters in due course. He also expects the Corporation to take into account the issues raised in this consultation.

QUESTION 6: Do you agree that, in order to meet the Mayor's objectives as described in this document, the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation should have the function to grant discretionary relief from non-domestic rates as set out in clause 185 [now clause 201] of the Localism Bill? If not, why not?

Of those that responded on this point, most felt that while this could be a useful tool for the Corporation to have at its disposal, it was hard to take a firm view in the absence of any specific proposals to use this power. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets opposed the

Corporation taking this power, because the Mayor had not published sufficient information about how and when the Corporation would use it. In recognition of the issues raised during the consultation, and in light of the ongoing uncertainty on the Government's overall approach to business rates reform, the Mayor does not now propose to grant this power to the Corporation from the outset. He does however remain open to the possibility that this power may be a useful tool for the Corporation in the medium-to-long-term future, and would not rule out making a decision to grant this additional power to the Corporation after it is established and once the overall business rates framework is clearer.

QUESTION 7: Based on the objectives described in this document, and the principles set out above, which existing agencies have programmes and assets which should transfer into the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation, and why?

The proposition that the Olympic Park Legacy Company (OPLC) should transfer into the Corporation in its entirety appears uncontroversial. The Mayor has also agreed with Government and LTGDC a provisional schedule of assets and projects that will transfer from LTGDC into the Corporation, which will be the subject of further detailed work in the period between now and the finalisation of the formal transfer scheme.

Following the sale of the Athletes' Village by the ODA, it can no longer be included in the list of publicly owned assets that might be candidates for transfer into the Corporation. Furthermore, the Mayor has agreed with Government that the assets of London & Continental Railways (LCR) that lie within the Corporation boundary will not transfer into the Corporation, although this agreement is based on the understanding that LCR and the Corporation will work closely together to secure the development and regeneration of their respective assets in a mutually beneficial way.

3. In addition to their responses to the seven key questions, respondents raised a number of other issues, either in response to the consultation document, or on subjects not covered by the document. The Mayor notes these responses, and has reached the following conclusions in light of them:
 - While the Mayor was careful to include a clear reference to **social and economic regeneration**, and an explicit reference to the convergence ambition, in his proposed purpose for the Corporation, he accepts that his published proposals may have placed a disproportionate emphasis on the physical regeneration responsibilities of the Corporation, at the expense of articulating what he sees as its equally important role in relation to social and economic issues. The Mayor is determined that the OPLC's commitments and early work in this field should be sustained and developed by the Corporation, in a way that benefits the communities beyond its boundaries, and in particular across the east London host boroughs.
 - The Mayor agrees with the respondents who stressed the importance of the Corporation **working in partnership** with other local, regional and national bodies in the public, private and voluntary sectors, and will again expect the Corporation to build on the achievements and relationships of OPLC, LTGDC and ODA. The Mayor places particular importance on a trusting and co-operative relationship between the Corporation and the four local authorities covered by its area.
 - While the expanded remit and geography of the Corporation will create a **resourcing** challenge for the medium-to-long term, the Mayor is satisfied that the Corporation will have sufficient core resources at the beginning. He will continue to prioritise resources from those available to him towards the Corporation while making the case for additional

resources from elsewhere and working with the Corporation to identify and maximise other possible sources of funding.

- Nothing raised in consultation has caused the Mayor to change his proposal that the board of OPLC as at April 2012 should be appointed as the **board of the Corporation**, subject to each individual meeting the specific requirements set out in the Localism Bill and taking into account the Bill's requirement that the Corporation's board includes an elected member from each 'relevant London council' (in this case Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest). The Mayor does however agree with those respondents who said that the skills and experience required by the board will change over time, and he is therefore committed to the principle of reviewing and, where appropriate, refreshing board membership as the terms of each member's appointment expire.
- The Mayor remains convinced of the case for 1 April as a **start date for the Corporation**, as set out in his consultation document. While he agrees that care must be taken to ensure that arrangements leading to the establishment of the Corporation are not disrupted or distracted from by activity relating to the Mayoral election in May 2012, he does not agree with those respondents who said that the timing of the election poses an obstacle to the formation and operation of the Corporation.

4. The Mayor is obliged by the Localism Bill to publish his reasons for not accepting any recommendations made by the London Assembly in respect of proposals relating to a Mayoral development corporation. To summarise his response to the Assembly submission:

- The Mayor accepts that the Corporation should have a clear set of objectives, rooted in the purpose which he has proposed for the Corporation, and reflecting the temporary nature of the Corporation's role and responsibilities.
- The Mayor takes very seriously the role that the Corporation should play in social and economic regeneration, while accepting that the Corporation should not encroach on matters that fall within the scope of other public bodies. The Mayor also accepts that valuable lessons must be learnt from the experience of previous bodies including the London Docklands Development Corporation.
- The Mayor agrees that the process of 'refreshing' the board that will occur as a result of appointment terms expiring gives a good opportunity to meet any requirement for new skills or experience arising from the transition from current OPLC to MDC.
- The Mayor agrees about the importance of local knowledge on the board and planning committee of the Corporation, and notes the Localism Bill's requirement that the Mayor appoint to an MDC board an elected member from each 'relevant London council'. He also notes, however, that it is for the Corporation board itself to determine the membership of its committees, including the planning committee, so it is not appropriate for the Mayor to go further than re-asserting his previously stated expectation that the planning committee should include nominees from the affected councils.
- While the Mayor has no in-principle objection to the Corporation retaining a Communities Committee like that created by OPLC, the constitution of committees is a matter for the Corporation board once established and the Mayor is inclined to leave this matter to the board's discretion.
- The Mayor accepts that the Corporation should publish an annual business plan which can be presented to the Assembly for discussion and debate.
- The Mayor is happy to clarify the position, as it currently stands, on the treatment of receipts from Olympic Park land: the Mayor and Government intend to revise the existing 2007 Memorandum of Understanding on Funding, and separately intend to agree a more

detailed protocol relating to the generation and treatment of receipts by OPLC and, in due course, the Corporation.

5. Following the publication of this statement, no further formal steps can be taken in relation to the establishment of the Corporation until and unless the Localism Bill has completed its passage through Parliament and the relevant provisions come into force. Once that has happened:
- the Mayor intends formally to notify the Secretary of State of his wish to designate a Mayoral development area and establish a Mayoral development corporation; this designation is likely to be based on the proposals described in this statement, but cannot be made until the relevant provisions of the Localism Bill have come into force;
 - on receipt of the Mayor's notification the Secretary of State will then be obliged to introduce secondary legislation to Parliament, to establish the Corporation. The Mayor hopes that this will happen within a timeframe that will see the Corporation come into existence as a legal entity by 1 April 2012 and take on its planning function from 1 October 2012;
 - at the same time, the Mayor and Government will agree a schedule of transfers from existing public bodies into the Corporation, for inclusion in one or more transfer schemes to be made by the Secretary of State and timed to allow the Corporation to be fully operational on 1 April 2012, and assume its planning function on 1 October 2012;
 - the Mayor will also formally make his appointments to the board of the Corporation; and at a time after 1 April 2012 to be agreed between its Founder Members, the OPLC will be formally wound up.

2 STATEMENT BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON

Introduction

1. The Government's Localism Bill, currently before Parliament ("the Bill"), includes proposals that would allow the Mayor of London to designate Mayoral development areas, and establish Mayoral development corporations (MDCs) to drive regeneration in those areas. To assist them in pursuing this purpose, all MDCs would have powers relating to: infrastructure; regeneration, development and other land-related activities; acquisition of land, including by compulsory purchase; streets; the creation of businesses, subsidiaries and other companies; and offering financial assistance.
2. The Bill's provisions include a requirement that the Mayor consult before he designates a Mayoral development area, and before he takes certain decisions about the powers that an MDC should have. The Bill's provisions also allow him to take into account consultation conducted before the Bill becomes law. In February 2011, the Mayor of London published for public consultation proposals to establish an MDC spanning the Olympic Park and some of the surrounding area. The period of public consultation ran until 28 April 2011.

Purpose of this statement

3. For the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation ("the Corporation") to be established, the Mayor must formally notify the Secretary of State of his designation of the Mayoral development area. The Secretary of State is then required to introduce secondary legislation to establish the Corporation. This statement does not represent that formal notification to the Secretary of State, because that notification cannot be made until the Bill has passed into law, which is not expected to happen until November 2011.
4. Instead, the purpose of this statement is to:
 - a. describe the Mayor's latest proposals with respect to the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation, focusing on the seven key questions posed by the consultation document, and giving in each case an overview of the consultation responses received and reasons for either changing, or not changing, his proposals either as a result of the consultation or because of other relevant events that have transpired since the publication of the consultation document;
 - b. based on these latest proposals, indicate the likely content of the Mayor's formal notification to the Secretary of State once the relevant provisions of the Localism Bill have passed into law;
 - c. respond to the additional issues raised during the consultation which are outside the scope of the seven key questions;
 - d. fulfil the requirements set out in the Localism Bill for the Mayor to publish a statement giving reasons for not accepting any recommendations made by the London Assembly in respect of proposals relating to a Mayoral development corporation, should he choose not to accept any of those recommendations; and
 - e. set out the remaining steps required to give effect to the Mayor's proposals.
5. This statement, and in particular the Mayor's response to issues raised during consultation, will refer throughout to the objectives and rationale as set out in his original published proposals. It is intended that this statement should be read alongside those original proposals, and it does not therefore reproduce wholesale the detailed contents of those proposals.

6. No assumptions can be made about the passage of the Bill through Parliament; the Mayor would only be able to seek to designate a Mayoral development area, and notify the Secretary of State accordingly, if and when the Bill receives Royal Assent, and in a manner that is consistent with its final provisions as enacted.
7. Before making any notification to the Secretary of State, the Mayor will therefore reconsider his final proposals when the Bill receives Royal Assent to ensure that they are indeed consistent with the Bill as enacted, and that the consultation he has conducted on the proposals has satisfied the requirements of the Bill as enacted.

Summary of responses and Mayor's consideration

8. The Mayor received 56 submissions in response to the consultation. These included responses from:
 - seven of the statutory consultees described in the Bill;
 - most of the other key public bodies and agencies currently working on regeneration and related activities in the area;
 - a number of landowners and developers with interests in and around the proposed boundary for the Corporation, and umbrella bodies representing the private sector;
 - a number of voluntary sector bodies and partnerships active in the area or with other specific interests in the legacy of the London 2012 Games; and
 - a number of residents and small business owners from areas in and around the proposed boundary for the Corporation.
9. As expected, responses to the Mayor's consultation concentrated on the seven 'Key Questions' highlighted by the Mayor, but also spontaneously raised other issues of interest or concern. This section summarises the consultation responses, and the Mayor's reaction to those responses, first in respect of the seven key questions, and then on those topics which were commonly raised in addition to those questions.

Key Questions

10. **QUESTION 1:** Do you agree that the designation of a Mayoral development area, and creation of a Mayoral development corporation, is the most effective way to meet the Mayor's objectives? If not, what arrangements would you propose instead?
11. A very large majority of respondents – including all the statutory consultees that responded – accept and support the case for an MDC in the area.
12. The only strong dissent from this position came from a modest number of local residents and businesses who raised concerns about local accountability and disruption to arrangements that are already in place and working well. The Mayor takes these concerns seriously, and is determined that his proposals should disrupt as little as possible local partnerships which are well established and give local people access to decisions about changes to their neighbourhoods. He will work closely with the OPLC and the four affected local authorities (Newham, Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest) throughout the process of transition to sustain and strengthen the involvement of local people and groups in the decisions and activities that affect them.

13. **QUESTION 2:** Does the proposed purpose of the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation correctly address the Mayor's objectives as described in this document? If not, how should it be changed?
14. The Mayor's proposal was that the purpose of the Corporation should be:
- "To promote and deliver physical, social, economic and environmental regeneration in the Olympic Park and surrounding area, in particular by maximising the legacy of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, by securing high-quality sustainable development and investment, ensuring the long-term success of the facilities and assets within its direct control and supporting and promoting the aim of convergence."
15. As with Question 1, the large majority of respondents to this question were broadly supportive of the Mayor's proposal.
16. A number of respondents raised questions about how the Corporation would structurally and operationally be set up to deliver some elements of this purpose, in particular those relating to broader social and economic regeneration in the context of the convergence ambition; this is dealt with in more detail below.
17. Some respondents, in particular those representing organisations working with a focus on a particular sector or subject, were keen to see additional responsibilities relating to their area of interest reflected in the purpose. In almost all such cases, while the Mayor agrees that the topic in question could be considered to be within the scope of the Corporation, he feels that those topics were covered by the more general terms used in his proposed purpose. He is not inclined to use the purpose of the Corporation to offer a detailed and exhaustive list of everything that might be meant by 'regeneration', 'legacy' or 'sustainable development', instead wishing to give the Corporation some discretion to interpret its purpose, in consultation with him.
18. **QUESTION 3:** Does the proposed boundary offer the best opportunity to achieve the objectives set out in this document? Should any area be omitted? Should any other areas be considered for inclusion?
19. The Mayor proposed that that the Corporation's boundary should describe the area containing the Olympic Park and Games facilities, and any of the surrounding areas (a) the success of which is directly interdependent with the success of the Olympic Park and (b) which has significant potential for regeneration and growth. This led him to propose a boundary encompassing:
- The core Olympic Park, comprising land owned by OPLC and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, including Eton Manor
 - The Olympic Village and associated development sites owned by London & Continental Railways Ltd and (until recently) the Olympic Delivery Authority
 - The Stratford City development site, including the Westfield Shopping Centre and Chobham Farm
 - Hackney Wick and Fish Island
 - Bromley-by-Bow North (with a southern boundary at the District Line)

- Pudding Mill Lane and Sugarhouse Lane
- Three Mills and Mill Meads
- Carpenters Estate

While the Mayor accepted that Stratford Town Centre met the criteria for inclusion, he expressed his respect for the progress made by the London Borough of Newham and its partners in developing a masterplan for the Town Centre, and was therefore minded to exclude it from the boundary.

20. Respondents to the consultation made no substantial objection to the criteria proposed by the Mayor for deciding which areas should be included within the Corporation boundary. Further, no respondent proposed that the boundary should not include any of the areas described in the list above based on those criteria; indeed the landowners within those areas that responded were broadly very supportive of the proposal that their assets be included within the boundary.
21. A number of respondents urged the Mayor to consider extending the boundary to include additional areas: Leyton Mills (to the north-east) and the RTZ, Parcellforce and Channelsea sites at and around Abbey Mills and West Ham (to the south-east).
22. The Mayor agrees that each of these areas meets the second of his proposed criteria, in that they have significant potential for regeneration and growth. However, he is not convinced that they meet the first criterion, which requires that their success be genuinely interdependent with that of the Park itself.
23. The Mayor understands the case for including Leyton Mills. Its current detachment from the Olympic Park site is in very large part a result of the severance created by the A12, and arguably its inclusion in the Corporation could be a driver for creating better links and bringing the two areas more closely together. However, as it currently stands, it is a distinct area, with strong connections to the north and east, and furthermore neither the relevant local authority nor private sector stakeholders were supportive of its inclusion. On balance the Mayor is not inclined to amend his proposals to include it.
24. Similarly, the Mayor takes seriously the suggestion that sites around West Ham be included within the boundary, especially given the support for this stated by London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the London Borough of Newham. However, on balance he sees the development of West Ham and neighbouring areas as a distinct project, just as strongly if not more strongly connected to areas to the south and east as to the Park, and he would be very concerned that by including these sites he would be expanding the scope of the Corporation's work into a separate part of east London which could in turn create an argument for still further extensions, for example into Canning Town. The Mayor believes that this would dilute the attention and resources of the Corporation in a way that would be detrimental to the Park and its immediate surrounding area, which remains his top priority. He is therefore not inclined to include these areas within the boundary of the Corporation.
25. In addition to these specific areas adjacent to the Park, a number of respondents were keen to propose rather larger additions to the boundary, taking in a much larger part of the Lea Valley and/or east London. The Mayor agrees that many of these areas are in need of regeneration – whether physical, social, economic or environmental; indeed this sits behind his strong commitment to the convergence ambition in relation to the six east London host boroughs.

Nevertheless, he is – as stated above – determined that the inevitably limited attention and resources of the Corporation should not be stretched so thinly as to jeopardise the future of the Park and surrounding area which remains his top priority. This does not, however, dilute the Mayor's more general commitment to development and regeneration across these other parts of London, and to using the other powers and resources available to him in line with the priorities described in the London Plan and his other strategies.

26. One local stakeholder urged the Mayor to reconsider his proposal to exclude Stratford Town Centre from the boundary. While the Mayor still accepts that the Town Centre meets his criteria for inclusion, he remains inclined to respect the existing arrangements there and not to amend the boundary to include it.
27. The Mayor was grateful to one respondent that noted a number of small discrepancies between the illustrative boundary map that appeared in the Mayor's consultation document, and the more detailed map that was available separately on the Greater London Authority website. The Mayor proposes to reconcile these discrepancies in his final proposals.
28. In conclusion, having given careful consideration to these additional suggestions, and aside from correcting the small discrepancies between the maps, the Mayor is not inclined to change his proposed boundary for the Corporation from that proposed in his consultation document.
29. **QUESTION 4:** In order to meet the objectives set out in this document, do you agree that the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation should take the full range of planning functions? If not, what other arrangements could be put into place to ensure a single, integrated and consistent planning framework for the area?
30. The very large majority of respondents accept the case for the Corporation taking development control powers for the area within its boundary; it appears that this is seen as a natural and necessary consequence of any development corporation being established.
31. Opinion was more divided on whether the Corporation should take plan-making powers. The large majority of private sector, landowner and developer respondents strongly supported the proposal that the Corporation should take all functions of a local planning authority, including plan-making powers. This was echoed by London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and the Olympic Delivery Authority (the two authorities that currently have development control powers in the area), and one of the local London Assembly members. Of the affected local authorities, who currently have plan-making powers for the area, all but one were opposed to these powers transferring to the Corporation; this was also opposed by the other local London Assembly member.
32. The Mayor understands the nervousness in these local authorities about the transfer of plan-making powers. It is a new approach, compared to the existing urban development corporation model where only development control powers are transferred; local authorities are naturally reluctant to cede direct plan-making power in favour of an arrangement in which they are only one of several participants and where the final decisions are not in their sole control.
33. However, none of the objections to this element of the Mayor's proposals were able to propose an alternative approach that addressed the Mayor's two fundamental concerns which led him to make this proposal: first, the risks of inconsistent planning policies in respect of

four different authorities, being made to different timetables and with potentially different policy approaches; and second, the ability of the Corporation to take a central role in developing the Community Infrastructure Plan and therefore administer the Community Infrastructure Levy for the area inside its boundary, functions which – as set out in the Planning Act 2008 – can only be carried out by the plan-making authority for any given area. In the Mayor's view, the Corporation's responsibilities must include sustaining and strengthening the confidence of current and future investors in the Park and surrounding area, and co-ordinating investment in infrastructure. In making his proposals, he believed the Corporation could not meet these responsibilities without plan-making powers, and none of the responses to the consultation has changed his mind on this important point. The Mayor therefore is not inclined to amend his proposals on this point.

34. Even among those respondents that support the Corporation taking plan-making powers, the consensus is that the Corporation's policy should build on existing borough policy where this is working well. The Mayor accepts this and expects the Corporation to take such an approach, as part of a wider co-operative approach between the Corporation and local authorities on planning and other matters, which is discussed later in this statement.
35. **QUESTION 5:** In order to meet the objectives set out in this document, do you agree that the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation should exercise its planning functions in the way proposed? If not, what alternative arrangements would you propose, and why?
36. A number of respondents advocated an approach to the Corporation planning function like that currently taken by London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC), whereby the processing of planning applications and the preparation of planning reports is undertaken by the relevant local authority on behalf of the planning authority, with the planning fee for these applications therefore going to the local authority rather than the planning authority. This contrasts with the model used by the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA), which processes its own applications and prepares its own planning reports, and retains planning fees accordingly. A choice between these two options (or any other options) is for the Corporation to make itself, and while the Mayor expects to be consulted about the Corporation's proposals in this area, he is not inclined to pre-empt its consideration of the options now.
37. The affected local authorities, the London Assembly and others expressed in their responses a strong interest in the precise composition of the Corporation's planning committee. The Mayor notes the degree of interest in this issue, but is also keen to stress that the composition of the planning committee is a decision for the Corporation itself (subject to the requirement in Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill to obtain the Mayor's agreement to the inclusion on a committee of any person who is not a member of the Corporation board). It is therefore not necessary, nor the Mayor believes appropriate, for him to state any final requirements or expectations on this matter beyond that already stated in his consultation document: that the planning committee should include representation from the affected borough councils which broadly reflects the area of each borough contained within the Corporation's boundary.
38. Given the Mayor's intention that the Corporation should not take on its planning powers until 1 October 2012, there will be plenty of time after the establishment of the Corporation in April 2012 for the Corporation board to explore, in consultation with the Mayor, the issues and options for detailed arrangements for discharging its planning functions, including in respect of the above issues. The Mayor will ensure that issues and concerns raised during this

consultation will be taken into consideration by the Corporation in deciding on these arrangements.

39. Some of the affected local authorities raised concerns about how Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be treated inside the Mayoral development area. Assuming the Mayor acts upon his proposal that the Corporation should have plan-making powers, and therefore have the power to set and raise CIL, these local authorities are concerned that the Corporation will not make investment in infrastructure for the benefit of areas outside the Mayoral development area, as would be the case if the local authority itself retained plan-making and CIL powers. The Mayor takes these concerns seriously, in particular as he is determined that a core purpose of the Corporation will be to ensure that the Park and its immediate environs are properly integrated with their surrounding neighbourhoods. To achieve this, infrastructure must be planned and designed to connect, and be shared between, these various areas rather than creating further divisions, physical or social, between them. However, the Mayor is equally clear that he has identified the Park and surrounding area as London's top regeneration priority, and he is not inclined to pursue an approach that would lead to CIL raised through development inside the Corporation's boundary being invested in a part of one of the affected boroughs where it would offer little or no direct benefit to the Mayoral development area. Precise arrangements for the Corporation's approach to CIL will, however, be developed by the Corporation itself through the preparation of its local development framework, which will be the subject of close ongoing discussion between the Corporation and the affected local authorities; the Mayor is therefore not inclined to try and settle this issue before it is necessary to do so, and without the Corporation's planning function and powers properly in place.
40. **QUESTION 6:** Do you agree that, in order to meet the Mayor's objectives as described in this document, the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation should have the function to grant discretionary relief from non-domestic rates as set out in clause 185 [now clause 201] of the Localism Bill? If not, why not?
41. Only a relatively small number of respondents expressed an opinion on this point. Of those, most felt that while this could, in principle, be a useful tool for the Corporation to have at its disposal, it was hard to take a firm view in the absence of any specific proposals to use this power.
42. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets went further, and opposed the Corporation taking this power, on the basis that the Mayor had not published sufficient information about the circumstances under which he would expect the Corporation to exercise the power, or the mechanisms it would use to do so, and until this information was available such powers should remain with local authorities.
43. Alongside the Mayor's emerging proposals for the Corporation, the Government is consulting on a range of possible measures relating to the wider reform of business rates, including possible mechanisms that would allow local authorities to benefit from an uplift in business rate income within their boundaries; Government has not yet set out its settled preferences with respect to this wider reform. The Mayor believes that his approach to this specific issue with respect to the Corporation must be informed by the wider context of business rate reform and in particular decisions about how any devolved business rates retention system might operate in the capital. Until that wider picture is clearer – and in particular until it is clear whether Mayoral development corporations would be able to benefit from uplift in rate

income within their boundaries – the Mayor believes that a decision to give the rate relief power to the Corporation could be premature.

44. Therefore, in recognition of the issues raised during the consultation, and in light of the ongoing uncertainty on the Government's overall approach to business rates, the Mayor is now not inclined to grant this power to the Corporation from the outset. When he originally proposed that the Corporation be granted this power, the Mayor did not expect the Corporation to use it in the short term, and therefore he does not expect that a decision not to grant this power would have any major impact on the Corporation's work over the short term.
45. The Mayor does however remain open to the possibility that this power may be a useful tool for the Corporation in the medium-to-long-term future, and would not rule out making a decision to grant this additional power to the Corporation after the Corporation is established and once the overall business rates framework is clearer, subject to the consultation requirements imposed by the Localism Bill.
46. If the Corporation is not granted this power, it would nevertheless retain an interest in any local authority using the same power within its boundary, as local authorities will be empowered to do by the Localism Bill. The Mayor would therefore expect that any local authority would consult the Corporation on proposals for granting discretionary business rate relief within the Corporation boundary using these powers. A requirement to consult affected MDCs could be set out in Government guidance on discretionary relief with which the Bill requires billing authorities to comply, ensuring that the consultation requirements in respect of local authorities granting discretionary relief are consistent with those applying to an MDC under the Bill.
47. **QUESTION 7:** Based on the objectives described in this document, and the principles set out above, which existing agencies have programmes and assets which should transfer into the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation, and why?
48. Responses to the consultation showed broad agreement with the Mayor's case for consolidating publicly owned assets and co-ordinating the development of those assets in a more streamlined and straightforward way than at present. This principle will underpin the schedule of transfers which the Mayor will seek to agree with Government, which will be responsible for giving effect to the transfers.
49. The proposition that all assets and programmes of OPLC should transfer into the Corporation appears uncontroversial.
50. At the request of the Mayor and Government, OPLC and London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC) have conducted a detailed study of the existing assets and projects of LTGDC that lie within the proposed CORPORATION boundary and which can therefore be considered as candidates for transfer into the Corporation. In each case, OPLC and LTGDC together considered whether the site in question was (a) significant in the context of the emerging strategic aims of the Corporation; and (b) at a stage in its development where the Corporation would have a meaningful role to play before completion and/or the LTGDC would not be able to complete the project before its projected wind-up in 2013. As a result, OPLC and LTGDC, along with the Mayor and Government, have agreed a provisional schedule of assets and projects that will transfer from LTGDC into the Corporation, which will be the

subject of further detailed work in the period between now and the finalisation of the formal transfer scheme.

51. Since the publication of the Mayor's consultation document, the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) has completed the sale of its interest in Stratford Village Development Partnership (which owns the Athletes' Village and neighbouring development sites) to a private consortium. The Village can therefore no longer be included in the list of publicly owned assets that might be candidates for transfer into the Corporation.
52. In light of the sale of the Athletes' Village, and separate discussions with Government about the future of the London & Continental Railways (LCR) land interests, the Mayor has agreed with Government that the assets of LCR that lie within the boundary of the Corporation will not transfer to the Corporation. The Mayor does, however, expect the Corporation to take a leading role in co-ordinating development and regeneration activity connected with all public sector assets inside its boundary, including those owned by LCR, and therefore expects the Corporation and LCR to work closely together in planning for the long-term future of their respective assets. If this arrangement proves difficult for any reason, or threatens to jeopardise the successful regeneration or integration of these two crucial landholdings, the Mayor may wish to revisit with Government the option of transferring LCR assets into the Corporation.

Other issues arising in consultation

53. A number of respondents stressed the important role they believe the Corporation must play in **social and economic regeneration**, both within the Corporation boundary and in the wider area, and raised concerns that this was not given adequate consideration in the Mayor's consultation document. Some drew particular attention to the shared ambition of convergence, observing that even very successful physical development in the Park would not on its own achieve a great deal towards that aim.
54. The Mayor was careful to include a clear reference to social and economic regeneration, and an explicit reference to the convergence ambition, in his proposed purpose for the Corporation. However, the Mayor accepts that his published proposals may have placed a disproportionate emphasis on the physical regeneration responsibilities of the Corporation, at the expense of articulating what he sees as its equally important role in social and economic issues. Given the important positive and negative lessons to be learnt from the work of previous large-scale regeneration projects, and the very significant importance placed by the Mayor on the convergence ambition and the contribution to that ambition that he expects the Corporation to make, the Mayor agrees that – if the Corporation were to neglect its responsibilities in this area – it will have substantially failed.
55. OPLC has already published a suite of policies, including a socio-economic policy and a sports and healthy living policy, which articulate how OPLC proposes to make an impact in this area. Even without the additional powers and scope of the Corporation, OPLC has shown its commitment to, for example: providing a mix of housing that meets local needs and aspirations; securing employment and training opportunities for local people arising from construction and operational activity in the park and venues as well as in new commercial development in the park; and ensuring that, by making the venues attractive and accessible to local people, progress can be made in tackling inactivity and promoting the other benefits of

participation in sport. This work will be a major element in the responsibilities of the new OPLC Executive Director of Regeneration and Community Partnerships.

56. The Mayor is determined that the OPLC's commitments and early work in this field should be sustained and developed by the Corporation, in a way that benefits the communities beyond its boundaries, and in particular across the east London host boroughs. As stated below, the Mayor nevertheless accepts the London Assembly's position that the Corporation must not stray into delivering programmes or services which are better or more appropriately delivered by existing public bodies already working in the area.
57. On a related matter, a number of respondents urged the Mayor to consider how the Corporation will **work in partnership** with other local, regional and national bodies – in the public, private and voluntary sectors – whose interests and responsibilities intersect with its own. Once again, the Mayor strongly agrees on the importance of this, and given the importance he also places on continuity will expect the Corporation to build on the achievements and relationships of OPLC, LTGDC, ODA and others to ensure that it does not have to start from scratch in developing relationships and establishing effective ways of working.
58. As stated in his proposals for consultation, the Mayor places particular importance on a trusting and co-operative relationship between the Corporation and the four local authorities covered by its area. With this in mind, he and OPLC have put in place specific arrangements to ensure that those authorities are involved in, and have a chance to influence, the emerging proposals for the Corporation in all the key areas where their roles and interests overlap. This includes regular high level engagement with the chief executives as well as a specific working-level focus on key issues such as regeneration, planning, park stewardship and employment and skills. These arrangements build on the links to the boroughs already established by OPLC, including through those members of the OPLC board with borough connections. The Mayor expects that the Corporation will further develop these arrangements when it is formed, to forge close long-term working relationships with the boroughs individually and collectively.
59. These proposals for the Corporation are emerging as part of a wider set of structural changes affecting development, regeneration and investment across London, and in particular in east London. These include the new Enterprise Zone and the Local Enterprise Partnership, as well as the new structures for housing and regeneration within the Greater London Authority arising from the transfer of functions previously undertaken by the London Development Agency and Homes & Communities Agency. The precise details of the working relationships between these bodies will emerge over the coming months, and will take some time to establish themselves fully; the Mayor is nevertheless determined that, while his proposals for the Corporation aim to streamline and simplify delivery arrangements within the Park and immediate surrounding area, the Corporation will still be operating in a multi-agency environment where effective relationships with these other bodies will be essential to success.
60. A number of respondents express concern over the **resourcing** available to the Corporation, particularly in light of the increase in responsibilities compared to the existing OPLC and the long-term nature of the Corporation's task. Even if the Mayor is correct in his assumptions about the Corporation inheriting the existing OPLC spending review settlement, and assuming the Corporation inherits (as planned) some resources attached to the projects and functions inherited from LTGDC and the ODA, the Mayor acknowledges that the expanded remit and geography of the Corporation will create a challenge for the medium-to-long term, particularly

given the constraints in public financing. This will also be affected by the arrangements, not yet fully settled, whereby the Government retains a financial interest in the proceeds of development on the Olympic Park land as a result of the agreement over the transfer of that land from the London Development Agency to OPLC, as well as by a wider range of issues affecting the overall grant to the Mayor for the GLA Group. However, the Mayor is satisfied that the Corporation will have sufficient core resources to begin with and that these outstanding questions should not deter him from creating the Corporation. He will continue to prioritise resources from those available to him towards the Corporation while working with the Corporation to identify and maximise other possible sources of funding.

61. A number of respondents raised questions and concerns about **appointments to the board** of the Corporation. Some respondents – including the London Assembly – note that the Corporation will have a different geographical remit and set of responsibilities from those of OPLC, and encourage the Mayor either to reconsider his proposal that the board of OPLC as at April 2012 should be appointed as the board of the Corporation, or to ensure that the board is refreshed over time, taking advantage of the expiry of each appointment to consider the opportunities and necessity for adjusting the range of skills and experience on the board. As stated here and elsewhere, the Mayor places a great deal of importance on operational and reputational continuity between OPLC and the Corporation, and is strongly inclined to adhere to his original proposal, subject to each individual meeting the specific requirements set out in Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill and taking account of that Schedule's requirement that the Corporation's board include at least one elected member from each 'relevant London council' (in this case Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest).
62. The Mayor does accept that the skills and experience required by the Corporation board will change over time, as indeed would those required by OPLC if the change to an MDC were not proposed, albeit to a lesser extent. He is therefore committed to the principle of reviewing and, where appropriate, refreshing board membership as the terms of each member's appointment expire. He would expect that each individual's appointment to the Corporation board would expire on the same date as that stipulated in his or her appointment to the OPLC board.
63. A number of bodies asked that they, or the sectors they speak for, be represented on the board. As the process of reviewing and refreshing the board takes place, the Mayor will consider all options for introducing new skills and experience to the board, but as stated above he is not inclined to add new members (or remove existing ones) at the time of transition in April 2012. The one exception to this arises from the Mayor's obligation, set out in Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill, to appoint to an MDC board at least one elected member from each 'relevant London council'. Accordingly and assuming that no unexpected changes are made to the current OPLC board before transition in April 2012, Hackney and Newham would already be represented when the OPLC board members are appointed to the Corporation's board. The Mayor will therefore be obliged to appoint elected members from Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest to the Corporation's board in order to fulfil this obligation.
64. A small number of respondents raised questions about the proposed **timing** of the Mayor's proposals, and in particular the date (1 April 2012) on which he proposed the Corporation should be up and running. These questions arose from the proximity of this date to the Mayoral election, scheduled to take place little over a month later. While the Mayor agrees that care must be taken to ensure that arrangements leading to the establishment of the Corporation are not disrupted or distracted from by activity relating to the election, he remains

convinced of the case for 1 April as a start date as set out in his consultation document. He does not believe that the timing of the election poses in itself any legal or administrative obstacle to the formation and operation of the Corporation, and is reassured that the general consensus over the case for creating the Corporation means that, whatever the outcome of the election, there should not be any disagreement about it or desire to rethink the fundamental proposition.

Response from the London Assembly

65. The Localism Bill states that the Mayor cannot make formal proposals for designating a Mayoral development area and creating an MDC unless he has published a statement giving reasons for not accepting any comments made by the London Assembly that he is not prepared to accept. The Assembly's comments are set out here (*in italics*), followed by the Mayor's response in each case.

66. **The proposed MDC must have a very tight set of objectives and be time limited so that there is a clear exit clause. This is to ensure transparency of purpose and to ensure a focus on rapid delivery by the MDC.**

The Mayor accepts that the Corporation should have a clear set of objectives. He proposes that these should be closely rooted in the purpose which he has proposed for the Corporation; as with the purpose, he is minded to set these out in guidance to the Corporation as provided for in the Localism Bill. The Mayor also accepts that the Corporation's role and responsibilities should be by their nature temporary, and that the Corporation should aim to achieve its objectives as rapidly as possible within the constraints of the market and other factors; this is why he proposes to review the Corporation on a regular cycle. However, the Mayor is reluctant to set a fixed lifetime for the Corporation before its work begins; market conditions and other factors make it impossible to predict the time it will take fully to develop the Park and surrounding area, and the Mayor considers that any fixed end date would be artificial and unhelpful. It is also worth noting that part of the Corporation's role will be to maintain and administer the parkland and facilities, tasks which will be required in perpetuity even after all development work is complete. In making plans for the winding up of the Corporation, the Mayor will need to be satisfied that adequate arrangements are in place to take on these elements of the Corporation's proposed role.

67. **Alongside delivering physical and environmental regeneration the objective of the OLPC will be to promote and deliver social and economic regeneration. The Assembly supports this objective, though the Mayor should not be encroaching on matters that fall within the scope of other public bodies (such as health or education). The Assembly would want to see the Mayor recognise the lessons that can be learnt from the experiences of the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC) so that planning can begin at an early stage for how the MDC will take this objective forward.**

As stated above, the Mayor takes very seriously the role that the Corporation should play in social and economic regeneration. At the same time, the Mayor accepts that the Corporation should not encroach on matters that fall within the scope of other public bodies, and indeed expects that the Corporation will work closely with those bodies to ensure that their work is complementary but not overlapping. The Mayor also accepts that valuable lessons can and

must be learnt from the positive and negative outcomes achieved by previous bodies including (but most certainly not limited to) the London Docklands Development Corporation.

68. **The Assembly notes that there should be a programme of refreshing the Board over time. The Mayor will need to consider as a matter of some urgency what combination of skills and talent is appropriate as the MDC begins its work.**

The Mayor accepts that careful consideration will need to be given to the balance of skills and experience on the board of the Corporation. The Mayor is highly satisfied with the work of the OPLC board to date, and places great importance on continuity between OPLC as currently constituted and the Corporation. This is why he does not propose a full overhaul of the board at the time of transition and instead proposes that the board of OPLC as at April 2012 should be appointed as the board of the Corporation, subject to each individual meeting the specific requirements set out in Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill and taking account of that Schedule's requirement that the Corporation's board includes an elected member from each 'relevant London council' (in this case Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest). However, he agrees that the process of 'refreshing' the board that will occur as a result of appointment terms expiring gives a good opportunity to ensure that any new skills or experience requirements arising from the transition from current OPLC to MDC are met.

69. **Elected local representation on both the MDC Board and the Planning Committee is necessary to ensure local support and confidence in the operations of the MDC. We would welcome clarity over the number of elected representatives from the boroughs on the MDC Board. Furthermore, while it is intended that there should be three elected politicians on the Planning Committee, we would welcome clarity on the size of the Committee so that it is clear what weight local views will have.**

The Mayor agrees about the importance of local knowledge on the board and planning committee of the Corporation – whether provided by locally elected representatives or others with strong connections to the local area. Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill obliges the Mayor to appoint to an MDC board an elected member from each 'relevant London council'. Assuming no unexpected changes are made to the current OPLC board before transition in April 2012, Hackney and Newham would already be represented when the OPLC board members are appointed to the Corporation's board. The Mayor will therefore be obliged to appoint elected members from Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest to the Corporation's board in order to fulfil this obligation. In addition to these local elected representatives, the OPLC board includes (and the Corporation's board would therefore include) a number of other people with strong knowledge and experience of the Olympic Park and surrounding area.

It is for the Corporation board itself to determine the membership of its committees, including the planning committee, so it is not appropriate for the Mayor to go further than re-asserting his previously stated expectation that the planning committee should include nominees from the affected borough councils appointed in a proportion which broadly reflects the area of each borough contained within the Corporation's boundary. It should be noted, however, that neither the Mayor nor any other person has stated that there will be three borough nominees on the planning committee.

It is important to stress the Mayor's clear expectation that, when serving on the board of the Corporation or one of its committees, a person's primary responsibility should be to the Corporation itself rather than to any other organisation or group with which that person has an

association. The Mayor is therefore reluctant to accept that any person will straightforwardly 'represent' any organisation or group when serving on the board or on a committee of the Corporation, while naturally recognising that a person's knowledge, expertise and priorities will be informed by one or more organisations or groups with which he or she has an association.

70. **To further enhance the links between the MDC and local people, we would welcome support from the Mayor for the current Communities Committee to remain a standing committee of the MDC.**

While the Mayor has no in-principle objection to this recommendation, the constitution of committees is a matter for the Corporation board once established and the Mayor is inclined to leave this matter to the board's discretion.

71. **As a new GLA functional body the MDC will be subject to Assembly scrutiny of policies, budgets and programmes. The Assembly will be able to call for people and papers and we would expect the same openness as other parts of the GLA with regard to the publication of spending and performance data. To support the transparency of this process we would welcome the publication of an annual business plan which can be presented to the Assembly for discussion and debate.**

The Mayor accepts this recommendation.

72. **Furthermore the Assembly notes that the consultation document states that the MDC will "generate returns through the development of its assets, subject to the terms of any revised understanding on the overall use of receipts from those assets, and the Mayor would naturally expect that any share of such revenue returning to the Corporation would be ploughed back into its operations." We would like some clarity on the use of capital receipts from these assets. A Memorandum of Understanding has previously been agreed regarding income from the Olympic site. However, the Memorandum does not indicate that any revenue will return to the MDC. So it is unclear where the revenue returning to the MDC will come from.**

Following the transfer of the Olympic Park land from the London Development Agency to OPLC, and the associated agreement between the Mayor and Government on the treatment of debt and receipts arising from that land, the Mayor and Government intend to revise the existing 2007 Memorandum of Understanding on Funding. They also intend to agree on a more detailed protocol relating to the generation and treatment of receipts by OPLC and, in due course, the Corporation. The Assembly will be informed about these agreements in due course.

The Mayor's latest proposals

73. The Mayor has carefully considered the submissions made during the consultation period, including that made by the London Assembly. In doing so, the first decision the Mayor has had to make is whether – taking into account the responses to Question 1 in his consultation document – he remains convinced that his objectives are best achieved by designating a Mayoral development area and establishing an MDC. The Mayor remains convinced of the case for doing so, and is encouraged by the near universal agreement on this point among those who responded to the consultation.

74. Having decided to proceed with designating a Mayoral development area and establishing an MDC, the Mayor has a number of further decisions to make. Set out below are the Mayor's latest proposals for the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation, having taken the submissions into account. As stated above, it is important to note that the proposals are all subject to reconsideration following the passage of the Localism Bill through Parliament.
75. The proposals are presented in three sections: section one covers those elements of the proposal which must be included in the Mayor's formal notification to the Secretary of State of his designation of a Mayoral development area, and which will form the basis of secondary legislation to be introduced by the Secretary of State; section two covers those elements of the proposal which must be included in the transfer scheme(s), subject to agreement with the Secretary of State; and section three covers those other issues which were raised in the Mayor's proposals for consultation but which can be given effect to without the need for further Government action.

For the Mayor's formal notification to the Secretary of State

76. **Boundary.** The boundary for the Mayoral development area will be unchanged from that described in the Mayor's consultation document, allowing for the very small changes required to ensure consistency between the two maps published during that consultation. This means the Mayoral development area will encompass:
- The core Olympic Park, comprising land owned by OPLC and the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, including Eton Manor
 - The Olympic Village and associated development sites owned by London & Continental Railways Ltd and (until recently) by the Olympic Delivery Authority.
 - The Stratford City development site, including the Westfield Shopping Centre and Chobham Farm
 - Hackney Wick and Fish Island
 - Bromley-by-Bow North (with a southern boundary at the District Line)
 - Pudding Mill Lane and Sugarhouse Lane
 - Three Mills and Mill Meads
 - Carpenters Estate
77. **Planning functions.** The Corporation will be the planning authority for the area described by its boundary for the purposes of both development control and plan-making, taking advantage of the full extent of powers permitted by the Localism Bill.
78. **Rate relief functions.** The Corporation will not be given the power to grant discretionary relief from non-domestic rates.
79. **The name of the Corporation.** The name of the Corporation will be the one proposed by the Mayor in his consultation document: the Olympic Park Legacy Corporation.
80. **Effective dates.** The Mayor will notify the Secretary of State that he wishes the Corporation to be established as soon as the legislative process allows, so that the transfers can take effect – and the Corporation effectively start full operations – on 1 April 2012. The Mayor will notify the Secretary of State that he wishes the Corporation to take its planning functions on 1 October 2012.

For the transfer scheme(s)

81. **Transfers from OPLC.** Continuity between OPLC and the Corporation is one of the Mayor's most important objectives; the existing OPLC will form the core of the Corporation. The Mayor therefore proposes that all properties, rights and liabilities of OPLC will transfer into the Corporation.
82. **Transfers from London Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LTGDC).** LTGDC has a number of assets and live projects in the Corporation area outside the Olympic Park, many of which will continue to be live in the period after the Corporation's establishment. The Mayor has agreed with OPLC and LTGDC that, where a project has a direct link with the re-opening Olympic Park, or where momentum needs to be maintained beyond the end of 2012 to assist in wider regeneration, the LTGDC's property, rights and liabilities related to that project should be transferred to the Corporation. Otherwise, the project should be completed by LTGDC or transferred to other partners. Where it is agreed that a project will transfer from LTGDC to the Corporation, the Mayor expects that funding required for that project would also transfer.
83. **Transfers from the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA).** Following the ODA's successful sale of its remaining interest in the Athletes' Village earlier in 2011, it is no longer necessary or appropriate to consider whether this asset should be transferred from ODA to the Corporation. Therefore, it is only the ODA's planning function that will be taken over by the Corporation, and the Mayor expects that funding, property, rights and liabilities associated with the ODA's planning function will transfer to the Corporation when the Corporation takes it over.
84. **Transfers from London & Continental Railways (LCR).** The Mayor does not propose that any transfers be made from LCR into the Corporation, but does expect the Corporation and LCR to work closely together in the development of their respective asset portfolios.
85. The Mayor does not intend to make any proposals for further transfers into the Corporation beyond those listed above.
86. As set out in the Localism Bill, transfers into the Corporation will be made using a transfer scheme to be made by the Secretary of State following consultation with the affected bodies. The Mayor's proposals with respect to transfers, as set out here, are therefore subject to agreement with the Secretary of State, and to the consultation which the Secretary of State is obliged to conduct.
87. **Staffing transfers.** The transfers proposed in this section, and the Corporation's taking on the role as planning authority for the area contained by its boundary, will automatically give rise to transfers of staff into the Corporation from predecessor bodies under the provisions of TUPE; the precise arrangements will be subject to a separate process following the publication of the transfer scheme, and transfers of staff need not be covered in that scheme. The Mayor welcomes the opportunity presented by such transfers of staff to retain the knowledge, skills and experience that have built up in the Corporation's predecessor bodies during the last decade.

Other matters

88. **Purpose of the Corporation.** In his February 2011 consultation document, the Mayor proposed that the purpose of the Corporation should be:
- “To promote and deliver physical, social, economic and environmental regeneration in the Olympic Park and surrounding area, in particular by maximising the legacy of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, by securing high-quality sustainable development and investment, ensuring the long-term success of the facilities and assets within its direct control and supporting and promoting the aim of convergence.”
89. The Mayor is content, having considered responses to the consultation, that this purpose still meets his objectives. In particular, he is content that this purpose sufficiently reflects his expectation, shared by many respondents to the consultation, that the Corporation should have a role in social and economic regeneration within and beyond its boundaries, as well as in physical regeneration.
90. The Mayor expects that this purpose will be the subject of Mayoral guidance or direction to the Corporation, under powers that he expects will be granted by the passage of the Bill.
91. **Exercise of planning functions.** As stated above, the Mayor is not minded to express any firm position on issues relating to the exercise of the Corporation’s planning functions, but rather prefers to wait until the Corporation is established and is able to consider those matters itself, in consultation with him, in advance of its taking on its planning powers on 1 October 2012. The Mayor’s power to take over strategic planning applications and determine them himself will not apply to applications within the Corporation’s boundary.
92. **Board appointments.** The Mayor still considers that each member of the board of the OPLC at the time of the Corporation coming into being should be appointed to the board of the Corporation, and the chair of OPLC appointed as the chair of the Corporation, subject to a formal process to be conducted once the necessary legislation has reached the appropriate stage and subject to each individual meeting the specific requirements set out in Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill; as required by Schedule 4A to the Greater London Authority Act 1999, this will include an Assembly hearing in respect of the appointment of the chair. In addition to these appointments, the Mayor will be required to appoint at least one elected member of each of Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest councils, in order to meet the obligation set out in Schedule 21 of the Localism Bill.

Next steps

93. Following the publication of this statement, no further formal steps can be taken in the establishment of the Corporation until and unless the Localism Bill completes its passage through Parliament and receives Royal Assent, and the relevant provisions come into force.
94. Once that has happened, the Mayor’s present intention is formally to notify the Secretary of State of his wish to designate a Mayoral development area and establish a Mayoral development corporation; this designation is likely to be based on the proposals described in this statement. The Mayor will publish this notification.

95. Upon receiving the notification, the Secretary of State will be obliged to introduce secondary legislation to Parliament, to establish the Corporation. The Mayor hopes that this can be done in such time that, subject to parliamentary process, the secondary legislation can take effect, and the Corporation can exist as a legal entity, in good time before 1 April 2012. The same secondary legislation will include the measures necessary for the Corporation to take on its planning function from 1 October 2012.
96. The Mayor will at the same time seek to agree a schedule of transfers from existing public bodies into the Corporation, along the lines set out in this statement, for inclusion in one or more transfer schemes that must also be made by the Secretary of State. The Mayor expects that the provisions of the transfer scheme(s) will take effect on 1 April 2012, from which point the Corporation will be fully operational, apart from those transfers associated with the ODA planning function, which will take effect on 1 October 2012. The Mayor will also, when he is legally entitled to do so, at some time early in 2012 and before 1 April, formally make his appointments to the board of the Corporation.
97. At a time after 1 April 2012 to be agreed between the Founder Members of the OPLC (who are the Mayor, the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government and the Secretary of State for Culture, Olympics, Media & Sport), the OPLC, which by that time will have no assets or staff, will be formally wound up.

Other formats and languages

For a large print, Braille, disc, sign language video or audio-tape version of this document, please contact us at the address below:

Public Liaison Unit

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA

Telephone **020 7983 4100**
Minicom **020 7983 4458**
www.london.gov.uk

You will need to supply your name, your postal address and state the format and title of the publication you require.

If you would like a summary of this document in your language, please phone the number or contact us at the address above.

Chinese

如果需要您母語版本的此文件，
請致電以下號碼或與下列地址聯絡

Hindi

यदि आप इस दस्तावेज की प्रति अपनी
भाषा में चाहते हैं, तो कृपया निम्नलिखित
नंबर पर फोन करें अथवा नीचे दिये गये
पते पर संपर्क करें

Vietnamese

Nếu bạn muốn có văn bản tài liệu
này bằng ngôn ngữ của mình, hãy
liên hệ theo số điện thoại hoặc địa
chỉ dưới đây.

Bengali

আপনি যদি আপনার ভাষায় এই দলিলের প্রতিলিপি
(কপি) চান, তা হলে নিচের ফোন নম্বরে
বা ঠিকানায় অনুগ্রহ করে যোগাযোগ করুন।

Greek

Αν θέλετε να αποκτήσετε αντίγραφο του παρόντος
εγγράφου στη δική σας γλώσσα, παρακαλείστε να
επικοινωνήσετε τηλεφωνικά στον αριθμό αυτό ή ταχυ-
δρομικά στην παρακάτω διεύθυνση.

Urdu

اگر آپ اس دستاویز کی نقل اپنی زبان میں
چاہتے ہیں، تو براہ کرم نیچے دئے گئے نمبر
پر فون کریں یا دیئے گئے پتے پر رابطہ کریں

Turkish

Bu belgenin kendi dilinizde
hazırlanmış bir nüshasını
edinmek için, lütfen aşağıdaki
telefon numarasını arayınız
veya adrese başvurunuz.

Arabic

إذا أردت نسخة من هذه الوثيقة بلغتك، يرجى
الاتصال برقم الهاتف أو مراسلة العنوان
أدناه

Punjabi

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ
ਵਿਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਨੰਬਰ 'ਤੇ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਹੇਠ
ਲਿਖੇ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਰਾਬਤਾ ਕਰੋ:

Gujarati

જો તમને આ દસ્તાવેજની નકલ તમારી ભાષામાં
જોઈતી હોય તો, કૃપા કરી આપેલ નંબર ઉપર
ફોન કરો અથવા નીચેના સરનામે સંપર્ક સાધો.

