

E1 – Protecting existing economic and employment functions

- a) OPDC will protect the functioning, attractiveness and competitiveness of the Strategic Industrial Location (SIL) and its ability to support employment and economic functions by ensuring proposals:
- i) are comprised of SIL compliant broad industrial type uses;
  - ii) increase, or at least maintain, employment densities;
  - iii) achieve no net loss of industrial floorspace unless this is required to make a more efficient use of space and provided this would not have a significant adverse impact on the overall amount of industrial floorspace in SIL;
  - iv) retain and/or provide small business units;
  - v) minimise and mitigate against any significant adverse impacts that development may have on surrounding land uses;
- b) In areas outside of SIL, proposals should support the retention of employment by:
- i) retaining or re-providing existing employment uses within suitable on-site premises, where they are compatible with the land use policy and/or other Local Plan policies applying to the area;
  - ii) supporting the relocation of any uses incompatible with the land use policy and/or other planning policies applying to the area. Applicants should demonstrate that there are suitable employment premises (of an equivalent quality/use/quantum/price point) elsewhere, applying the following sequential approach:
    - » within the OPDC area;
    - » within the London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith & Fulham area; or
    - » within the rest of London and beyond.
  - iii) where part b)ii above applies, ensuring that the redevelopment incorporates alternative

- There are over 5482 jobs in OO – to be comprehensively redeveloped - a lot to lose.
- Most new jobs are going to be in the S, near HS2 station site (41,300) new jobs. 3,500 in the Car Giant site. There's a big question on how the section in the S will be developed.
- Relocation of the existing jobs was something the GUA raised last time - still of concern.
- There are also to be 10,000 in PR, through intensification – but some will be displaced.
- Public transport problems in PR are of concern – the time it takes people to get to work there. It takes at least half an hour to get in and out.
- A charter should be drawn up to retain existing jobs and clusters of artisans and makers (an issue GUA raised previously). This isn't mentioned in the policy.
- Supporting firms / artists relocation is mentioned in the supporting text.
- Another issue raised by GUA previously was about future land use - of that abutting Park Royal and industrial uses and that there should be some mitigation. There is some response to that – on page 2.
- This large loss of jobs is very significant to the area – both a wide diversity of types jobs and those employed in them. We don't know yet the effect of Brexit, although we do know that in some areas, nursing for example, people from the EU not applying to join register. If there are lot of EU workers in the area the overall loss may have less of an impact on longer term communities.
- Most of the fallout from Brexit will be done and dusted before anything is actually developed. Car Giant isn't scheduled to move out for another 4 years, so there will be time to attenuate any policies. Strategically, the OPDC did a piece of work on jobs in PR comparing with of other industrial areas such as Trafford, which is probably reasonably comparable. It also looked at London E gateway, Slough., and Crawley where it seemed they were not finding a lot of difference. But, in PR rental costs are going up and businesswise there doesn't seem to be a lot of concern about vacant spaces rather there are not enough spaces – so its reasonably healthy.
- PR has very low vacancy rate and what is seen as an infinite demand for strategic industrial land, because across London it's being lost / used up for development. In

<p>employment uses in line with the relevant Place policies;</p> <p>c) Development adjacent to SIL will only permitted if applicants can demonstrate that proposals will not materially affect the ongoing functioning of existing employment activities.</p>	<p>protecting industrial land and intensifying here, there should be plenty of demand. They have an evidence based document on future growth employment sectors that could come to PR, including clean tech, light manufacturing, circular economy, creative industries and a huge amount of commercial and office based activities that locate around the HS2 station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do we have a view on some of these sectors and ambitiousness of this?</li> <li>• For residents, intensification is all very well, but will there be proper mitigation provided in terms of transport and accessibility. What are the consequences of the intensification.</li> <li>• Do the 10,000 new jobs in PR include the 5,550 losses from Old Oak? Are they not relocating these jobs? Are just disappearing?</li> <li>• It's not clear.</li> <li>• It is unlikely that these will be relocated in the area.</li> <li>• There are some suggestions of relocation, but basically this is down to discussion with developer on particular sites.</li> <li>• GUA also raised the issue of affordability for business, artist and cultural workers before.</li> <li>• There is a view that there is no lack of demand for spaces and no real need to get people in as its well established. Transport and fragmentation of ownership are issues. One of the comparators identified from the Slough industrial estate (in the OPDC evidence based document) was owned entirely by one company, so in that situation driving new roads and infrastructure was relatively straight forward. A lot of deals that would need to be done along one street in Park Royal with 50 different land owners.</li> <li>• The difficulty of thinking about employment and economic development in the area is that there are two quite different sites – PR is one consideration where there are not going to be so many new jobs -10,000 - and possibly a lot of intensification. Probably there would not be so much displacement but rents might go up and the kind of accommodation available might not be suitable. Currently there are lots of small scruff properties. Loss of local jobs, different kinds of jobs coming in. What kind of activities might these be and how will they impact on the surrounding or residential areas nearby.</li> </ul>
---	--

	<p>Most OO jobs will be commercial, retail on the High Street and some mixed-use activities – the main concentration being HS2. Two distinct issues and areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Old Oak, the main pragmatic development will be the car Giant site – developing a lot of homes and jobs which will take up a large amount of space in the early stages. The concern there is what will happen to existing businesses and what kind of new home and jobs will be envisaged in the early phases when there will be a lot of construction, but not very high-end development coming in. Where might development provides some community benefit? Some of the early development on the Car Giant site will be student accommodation, co-living that kind of thing. There could be an opportunity to ensure that small businesses have a place and role there.</li> <li>• There is nothing to stop developers coming through now with proposals around PR now. I don't know if any are already coming through. I guess the driver will be having this dirty great development on their doorstep which may result in more than perhaps they would have wanted done.</li> <li>• Would we have got the 10,000 jobs in PR anyway? Do some just want their flag on it.</li> <li>• You could have a loss of jobs and de-intensification. The difficulties of transport issues and fragmentation of ownership has already been pointed out. It is difficult unless it's the big sheds types of development. I have doubts about whether the 10,000 would have occurred anyway.</li> <li>• The jobs per hectare is going down by hectare. There are a lot of logistics going on with quite well-paid companies, but the numbers of people they are employing is less than say with the guys doing metal bashing in sheds.</li> <li>• So are we saying that the OPDC will reverse the trend for more big sheds in PR and to actually have more people working in high density.</li> <li>• This is the aim but without the strategy behind it.</li> <li>• In terms of intensification the OPDC is trying to encourage developers to come in to intensify – to do higher rise development. They have been quite active and will be pressing for development to achieve outcomes. Most of what they say they want to</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>achieve in the document is expected to be delivered though developers and section 106 negotiations over several years. In that space (negotiations between planners and developers) it is quite difficult to have any influence. How you can local people be sure they get the outcomes that the policy proposes. The Strategic policy SP5(a) (p24) talks of protecting, strengthening and intensifying Strategic Industrial Land as a major aim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PR is difficult. I'm a resident. Every worker goes there goes by car as it takes so long to get there by bus or tube. It's like an island. If you are a worker or resident there is nothing to do. There is the hospital and ASDA, the environment is not very inviting for workers. Diagio and others have developed fancy buildings, but I wonder if people want to work there? They just go there and home again – there are no walks that you might want to take.</li> <li>• The OPDC has now divided PR up into 3 parts – with one section that talks about the old sheds and the old part of PR, made up of smaller spaces. They want to protect PR Centre (another designated area). People do just come to work and then go home again -so defining a PR centre is the centre is rather meaningless. Not that I don't support it being there and enhancing it. PR is choked by people who drive there, park where they work and then go home again. There is lots of off-road parking. But, the OPDC not the highways authority – the boroughs are.</li> <li>• What sort of places are being created for workers and residents and how could the development be directed in a way to facilitate making a good place and mitigate the transport concerns. This document is quite close to what they want to submit to government and so if at this stage people want to make proposals, it would be good for those to be very specific – for example saying contributions from developers to support improvement to the built environment should be secured.</li> <li>• There is clearly room to build up higher. The roads need to be wider and pavements too. For Coronation Road, we should make room. Businesses would benefit from better environment. Don't know if the companies are likely to hire local people.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers should perhaps support better traffic flow, make a contribution to transport costs, ensure that improved services or facilities for residents and workers are provided.</li> <li>• Coronation Rd is a good example. On the N-side going towards the hospital and coming off the A40 there is the Matrix warehouse project. It's good, set back from the road and provides parking for its workers behind the sheds. The other half of the road at the W end is car repair body shops, recycle and warehouses, stone masons and granite works – all sorts of small under-the-arches type of work spaces – dirty and congesting the place. Not a pleasant place to walk. That could be addressed when a developer comes into the local vicinity. But you can't address the transportation issues. There's going to be a 74% increase in road traffic over the years on Coronation Rd.</li> <li>• This is the sort of thing that it should be possible to demand.</li> <li>• We need to come up with schemes – as you can't get in or out of PR.</li> <li>• How do you get a number of smaller contributions combined to address some of these transport problems? This would be important to consider in consultation responses.</li> <li>• We shouldn't be trying to prettify – all these businesses are important to the area.</li> <li>• There are cars dumped in the road.</li> <li>• Policy E1 is promisingly called protecting existing economic and employment functions. The wording here is very important to think about, it is promising (re SIL) and makes all the right noises. Supporting text is positive. It talks of the diversity of sizes of spaces – the mix being key its advantage (9.9) They say developers tend to favour medium and large spaces and note that small businesses increasingly find it difficult to find space and that they want to make sure more is done to support business start-ups and for them to remain in the area. (9.10) Affordability?</li> <li>• Outside of SIL they talk in text 9.12 of developers demonstrating robust engagement with affected businesses, to ascertain whether they wish to occupy newly created space. To help make employment re-provision space affordable they say existing rents should be taken into account, with an agreed uplift to reflect better quality provision negotiated. Future reviews should be in line with RPI at commercially standard rates.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Lease terms should ensure tenure security (suggested 10 years). (NB the earlier version talk about relocation in the area and in surrounding boroughs plus ... has this been removed from policy?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any negotiations with developers will have to compete with issues such as delivery of 'affordable housing' and infrastructure.</li> <li>• How will this happen.? Are we trying to relocate small businesses within the area? Developer will just see them as a problem and will want to get them out. The GLA will be quite happy for them to go anywhere else in London. Would the GLA or the OPDC take a lead on the relocation?</li> <li>• Good question.</li> <li>• The Central Middlesex hospital regenerated the area on land that they owned. New developments were provided behind the hospital, big sheds an initially promised housing, although this didn't materialise. It's very good. They have good access, close to A406 and don't have a lot of transportation problems. But this doesn't help us or PR in trying to solve its transportation problems. I didn't see anything about certain types of industry being encouraged in certain areas, or size of industry.</li> <li>• Large sheds may have more jobs.</li> <li>• They may not. They may be warehouses with robots and white vans, with big lorries coming during the night – distribution - not creating industry.</li> <li>• If relocation has an adverse effect on businesses it is a huge problem.</li> <li>• Policy E1b(i) talks about old oak and existing businesses retention or relocation. I'm sceptical that these will be relocated, shoe horned into the OPDC area – or even to get into surrounding boroughs, given the attrition rates there are in terms of employment space and actually across London. I'm sceptical that the sequential approach will actually happen. Inevitably, if fear, businesses in old oak will fold and disappear.</li> <li>• This is a moment to demand that businesses do have an option to remain.</li> <li>• I haven't seen anything recent about the regen officer from the GLA coming in to help resolve matters.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expectation that OPDC will do anything is unlikely</li> <li>• They should, they are not simply creating a plan they are creating a place and obligation is on them.</li> <li>• There should be a marketing exercise carried out of existing businesses, setting out info on all the businesses intending to stay, the level of demand and what is available / accessible in the OPDC and borough areas.</li> <li>• This is a broader and more systematic approach- than leaving this to individual discussions with developers.</li> <li>• This could ask businesses whether they see themselves as being here in 5 years' time – although likely the market will determine this. I imagine a lot of the jobs at OO will just go as a result of the HS2 depots taking over a lot of the land. I presume that HS2 Ltd is also looking at relocations – effectively compulsory purchase of the land. There are huge areas including tunnel gate and N Acton station. They will release the land back again after 2016.</li> <li>• You might find it interesting to look at the map (evidence based document 18 – to look at where existing businesses are). I would say most of the businesses will be affected in the early stages of development – in Scrubs Lane, Victoria Road OO Common Lane.</li> <li>• We should be able to see the relocation strategy now, shouldn't we?</li> <li>• We will see a lot of employment churn – eg Macro this will be flattened next year and this is where all the concrete bits for the tunnels for HS2 will be made until such times as they have made it and then handed back to whoever.</li> <li>• They talked about hybrid uses at the board meeting / planning committee meeting, so if PR is industrial and OO commercial. On the HS2 land, large amounts will be for depots and construction site, which they will want for 15 years, then they will all be released back again, some of which they say will be commercial and industrial – new 21 C technologies.</li> <li>• In the long term, this will impact on people in the N of OO and Park Royal area. They suggest 2 options for that land – to go back to conventional industrial uses or industrial business parts – a bit like the Brent part of PR now.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would give rise to a bit more work</li> <li>• Allowing people to decant from existing areas into something new and create a space in PR would allow businesses to grow or shrink.</li> <li>• The OPDC will be interested in trying to manage some of that. This is in section 9.12 of text if people are interested in following this up.</li> <li>• It's difficult to see how they would actually turn down a planning application that didn't actually do that. At perfume factory – they first promised that existing businesses would remain as users, then changed their minds, but will still be given planning permission.</li> <li>• Commercial premises are very expensive, and so exiting users, even if they want to stay – won't be able to afford to – as elsewhere, such as at Westway they will be priced out.</li> <li>• Policy text 9.13 discusses affordability. Some of the wording is positive, with a lot of good ideas. The fatal flaw is that this will all be down to negotiation with developers and there will be competition with other needs such as affordable housing etc.</li> <li>• They can't enforce low rents for businesses as far as I know.</li> <li>• Some local authorities have done this.</li> <li>• While there are good words in the supporting text, this needs to be in the policy to direct what the developers will do, otherwise its not really worth the paper it's written on. When we make responses to the consultation we need to try get some of this into the policy.</li> <li>• Something we should stress is trying to get a zoning or protection for residential properties, we can't have industrial backing onto residential properties.</li> </ul>
--	--



## POLICY E2: New Employment Floorspace

- a) Proposals for new office floorspace will be supported where:
  - i) they are located in a town centre and, can support its position in the town centre hierarchy; or
  - ii) the requirements of the sequential test have been satisfied, in accordance with Policy TCC1;
- b) Proposals for new industrial floorspace will be supported within SIL and in other appropriate locations identified in the Place policies;
- c) Proposals for new employment floorspace either in commercial or mixed use schemes, will be supported where they;
  - i) are of an appropriate scale and suitably located in line with Strategic and Place policies;
  - ii) provide a mix in the type and size of accommodation, having regard to the need and/or linked to demand from identified future growth sectors and for artist studios;
  - iii) are based on a clear understanding of business needs and are of satisfactory quality; well designed and serviced; adaptable and readily available. Ground floor units should be a minimum of 4 metres in height;
  - iv) make an efficient use of the site, taking into account their overall employment capacity, employment densities and contribution towards meeting other planning policies; and
  - v) have been designed to protect the amenity of nearby occupiers and respond to neighbouring land uses; and
- d) Where development proposals involve the provision of over 1,000sqm of new employment floorspace in either commercial only or mixed use schemes, they will be required to:
  - i) demonstrate as part of their Marketing Statement, appropriate engagement with potential occupiers to inform the design, fit out and management of employment space;

- E2 a few things that GUA highlighted before. In section C they say developments will be approved where they protect amenities, neighbouring properties and land uses.
- I don't support the argument that there should be work / live as this could impose restrictions on types of industry (welding for example at 2am) which then forces more businesses out / you get this happening. You can do this at the moment in a 24-hour industrial zone like PR and we don't really want this to change it's important to secure employment.
- That's why we need zoning – a commercial space that will close at 5pm and the industrial to be able to continue all night. The food factories are a problem with so many in the PR area. The smell will attract attention and will get an increasingly strong voice from new residents, which could end up getting them closed down or having to get new ventilation systems – properly installed and working.
- We need to look carefully on the issue of residents / industry and co-location and how that's managed – not just in this section of the policies but also in the places section. We need to look at what is going on where and how new residents may wish to respond.
- They say here that mixed development is the most successful so we should all benefit if we get more services for both workers and residents. We need some standards. We need businesses but we also need decent pavements without cars parking on them. Some of the buildings in PR are old and dirty – so why not rebuild them to a new standard?
- A positive thing is that request that artist studios (there are hundreds working in the area) have got quite a good hearing now where they hadn't before. So in E2 c(ii) it talks about accommodating a mix of housing and artist studios with supporting text talking about live work units and a number of workshops across the area. That is quite an achievement. Final point (d) and (di) they talk about a range of costs and tenure arrangements. This also talks about small business ownership.
- Mixing artist studios within residential can sometimes be difficult and can depend on the type and size of work (some types of work can be noisy and smelly). The choice of old industrial buildings is that they tend to provide large open spaces. Do we have evidence

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii) incorporate a variety of unit sizes and typologies including provision for small businesses;</li> <li>iii) provide a range of cost and tenure arrangements;</li> <li>iv) have regard to the need/demand identified from future growth sectors and to support creative and cultural enterprises; and</li> <li>v) deliver an appropriate proportion of the total new employment floorspace in line with policy E3 a)-c) or provide a financial contribution towards low cost and/or open workspaces and studios, subject to viability.</li> </ul>	<p>of any that works well elsewhere? Are there also not issues where work units have been used just as residential?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the benefit of people who didn't come to the transport discussion, I think what you want to do with new industrial floorspace is much as you would want to do with residential – that is to have almost car-free development. This supports what has been said about being chocked up by traffic. I accept the fact that there are businesses that have deliveries and collections during the day – a rep may just come for half an hour or so. What I'd want to see in this or in the transport section is specifically try to build over existing car parking space – that are filled with people coming in the traffic jam in the morning and again in evening.</li> <li>• If there is such a demand for industrial workspace that is to our advantage. Encourage in developers who have no trouble in filling spaces, but build very little employee parking.</li> <li>• You have to have the public transport – then to educate the workers about using it.</li> <li>• I'm still on E2 b and cii – I'm having difficulty in seeing how these policies will jell together. I would like policy E1 - protecting existing employment (notably the 5,500 jobs in OO) to feed into E2, where existing businesses get first dibs on new floor space. don't see anything in E2 that would enable this to happen. It's a standalone policy.</li> <li>• I used to live in Wembley Park. It took 20 minutes by train from PR to Bond Street. For me to go to Willesden it takes about 45- 60 minutes – taking 2 buses. If better transportation were available people wouldn't go by car. Everywhere I go it takes 45 minutes – except going to ASDA. Its 45 minutes by us to Wembley – it's insane</li> <li>• The Mayor of London's strategy on transport is that wherever there is high levels of transportation, they double the density. In Old Oak, with HS2 coming in and Crossrail we will have very high density and high rise. But, before anything goes to planning they have to carry out a transport assessment to see how the development will affect local people in the area – if you find out what was the outcome of that survey it will help.</li> <li>• Almost all the developments aim to have almost no car parking spaces. The point is that this should be the same in the industrial area too is a useful point.</li> </ul>
--	---

### POLICY E3: Supporting Small Businesses

New low cost and/or open workspaces, including artist studios, will be supported where they:

- a) are of a satisfactory quality, appropriately located, well designed, readily available and adaptable to meet changing business needs, particularly for the identified employment growth sectors in Figure 9.3;
- b) are managed by an OPDC approved workspace or studio provider and supported by an approved Management Scheme;
- c) demonstrate that they are suitable for supporting micro and small businesses, having regard to ensuring appropriate:
  - i) size and type of workspace;
  - ii) provision for start up businesses including a proportion of discounted rental terms and/or onsite business support services, taking into account the most up to date information on rent and service charge levels; and
  - iii) security of tenure.

- **Re E3 and E4.** Both policies come up with ideas that the OPDC would like to be able to select good providers of these two kinds of things – through providers who can do low cost or creative sector kinds of businesses. They would like to approve a provide with a good track record, by going through a process of evaluating and selecting them, who could to provide start- ups and small businesses. It seems that this would be a way of prioritising certain corporate providers. They have the same idea for the live-work units. At the moment, the live work units are to be outside the SIL – to go against proposals for these to be along the buffer zone between the OO residential and PR industrial areas.
- I think the word corporate means that they mean that what they want / intend to do is have a registered company who will submit a full tender – and through them you might have an agent that is actually putting through a multi-company tender.
- The work live seems to not be very much live related.
- It has a nice attractive inside – garden area / courtyard
- It isn't this like Nash House on the canal-side where you have people living above and a studio below and meeting spaces.
- They say that both the living and working spaces will be in the same building or have an internal division between the two – something about them being tethered together.
- You could have something like a Chinese chophouse – were you live above the shop.
- You need to be careful to control what goes on in the work part of the building and that 2am welding is not going on. But you don't want to become a 'residential area'
- They want to prevent this – by having a clear separation between the two
- Community hub / spaces – is not mentioned.
- This is a recognition of what's happening across London – with too much becoming residential. Issues for example such as having parks with residential properties around – then having people complaining about the noise from the part and then you lose the park – which happened just down the harrow road here. If you have a genuine industrial area you can have metal bashing all hours but not if it's in a residential area.
- This is the same thing as the afterhours workshop – live-above-studios.

## POLICY E4: Work Live Units

Work-live units will only be acceptable where:

- a) there is demonstrable demand specifically for work-live or they are to be delivered as a meanwhile use;
  - b) they are outside of SIL and located in an area considered appropriate for this type of use;
  - c) the residential and employment uses are intrinsically linked (either in the same building or tethered);
  - d) where both work and live uses are occurring within a single unit, there is some internal division between the living and working spaces;
  - e) where both work and live uses are occurring within a single unit, the spatial arrangement, design and building type is predominantly commercial in character;
  - f) the access arrangements allow for visible and direct access for business visitors and suitable servicing by heavy goods vehicles;
  - g) the environmental performance meets targets for residential accommodation, particularly with regards to sound proofing, energy and insulation;
  - h) where appropriate, spaces of interaction are incorporated within the building;
  - i) it would be managed by an OPDC approved provider with a proven and successful track record of delivering work-live units and a management plan can be agreed;
  - j) they can support a mix of businesses, working across a wide range of sectors, particularly for the identified employment growth sectors in Figure 9.3;
  - k) businesses have active frontages and a visible street presence for branding opportunities; and
  - l) the tenure arrangements can demonstrate an intrinsic link between the both uses and appropriate protection and enforcement is in place to prevent residential reversion.
- That's OK if you are a designer with a drawing board or but if you want to do a bit of light casting and heating up – then you are going to run into trouble.
  - The way I read the policy on live-work units is that they have to fulfil all the criteria – there is no 'or' – all the criteria has to be fulfilled – it suggests meanwhile uses (just for a short time)
  - Some of this early development could have quite a lot of work in and also student / co-living etc – which could be good for meanwhile uses, but longer term, if taking about residential spaces you need green and play spaces etc. What will happen with all these kinds of things – this needs to be thought about.
  - Some of this is about reducing the need to travel
  - Although it's not always good for people's mental health to be so close to where they are working without community facilities etc. There is none of this here.
  - There are not supposed to be children in these live / work units – so there will be little pressure to have green and open space.
  - We should think about mixed use where there is some flexibility, including public space and heritage.
  - In Hackney Wick, Fish Island there were issues of people having live-work units that were just being used for residential uses.
  - Perhaps a good reason to separate – even if just a short distance away.

<p>E5 Local access to training, employment and economic opportunity</p> <p>Major development proposals will be required to work in partnership with relevant stakeholders to develop a Local Labour, Skills and Employment Strategy and Management Plan for approval by the OPDC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be lots of jobs involved in construction. How can the planning process assist in supporting local people – particularly in skills training and access to jobs for local people (issue raised previously by GUA). This is long term – over 25 years.</li> <li>• E5 is really very short in policy terms – this might be one of the examples where we try to get some of the good supporting text into the policy.</li> <li>• The major development projects (according to supporting text) will be required to develop a <b>Local Labour Skills and Employment Strategy and Management Plan</b> (policy) which would need to be approved in the pre-planning application process. (The earlier version said “with the boroughs and would be secured by a legal agreement” – this is now removed).</li> <li>• It looks like OPDC is not going to do so much but will expect the major developers to take forward a legally binding management plans on this.</li> <li>• Supporting text highlights that some parts of the north and south-east have 10% of the most deprived in the country - so vital that this benefits these local communities To ensure proposals for major developments are meeting OPDC socio-economic regen priorities the LLESMP should be developed – (including jobs advertised locally, training centres on site, actively support BME groups, using local supply chains, securing apprenticeships, mitigating impact). Mention of legal agreement now seems to be gone.</li> <li>• OPDC is to undertake brokering training, apprenticeships and jobs - with public private and third sector, working with schools and using procurement of works and services to promote local employment, training, and apprenticeships and encourage supplier diversity and SME involvement in supply chains. (supporting text)</li> <li>• OPDC will (supporting text says) work with HS2 and other transport bodies and their supply chains and end use employers to share labour forecasting data on construction and end use requirements to help plan for local employment .....</li> <li>• Is the another supporting document that spells all this out?</li> <li>• Supporting text – 9.39 says that further details on the requirement and scope of the LLESMP will be provided in the Planning Obligations SPD.</li> </ul>
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quite a lot of this – important part of the socio-economic regen commitment – will be undertaken by the developer and would be part of planning gain – again competing with affordable workspace, affordable housing, infrastructure, transport mitigation.</li> <li>• Shouldn't there be a proportionate commitment from smaller developments – thinking particularly of PR and some of the 1920's buildings that are coming to the end of their lives. We want intensification, so we probably want these developed. But these are relatively small sites – owned presumably by freeholders who will need to be persuaded to carry out development. But, we would want them to be required to do a smaller amount of this. If they are employing double the amount of people on their land – it would be good if there were a smaller version of the LLESMP for them.</li> <li>• There might be different way around this – a code of agreement or funding of something that the OPDC would implement through the various funding obligations. The policy here seems a very fragile way forward.</li> <li>• It does seem to be a watering down of policy. Once you start putting the onus on just large developments, you could open the way for lots of small ones. You then lower the threshold and no one does anything. It would be nice to think there was some methodology of putting everyone in, so if you are going to do a development you need to sign up to a number of things. This speaks again to the fragmentation – and is the OPDC rowing back on ongoing co-ordination.</li> <li>• This is not PR that they have in mind here, although it is a money spinner. You have to remember the OPDC come into this, not because they have our general welfare in mind, but that they have to get a lot of money out of the developers to fund infrastructure etc. They are going to be negotiating these agreements when in fact they are also going to be maximising development - a bit of a muddle in terms of delivery.</li> <li>• What do they class as major? Another point is that it is for developers to work with the local authorities to ensure that this is successful – especially on job creation, skills and apprenticeships there are already models available. Should they not be saying -well if you</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>are going to spend £50m we expect that we get 2 or 3 apprenticeships per £1million. That could be part of the agreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on the boroughs role (nothing that they have different agendas) and that of the OPDC as the planning authority.</li> <li>• While acknowledging the OPDC's role in terms of planning – it does need to say how they are going to link up with the local authorities.</li> <li>• Supporting text 9.42 says applicants should engage early and work in partnership with the OPDC, the boroughs, local businesses / business partnerships., local community and other stakeholders.</li> <li>• A lot of the boroughs do link up and work together – for example the tri-boroughs – they are collating stuff on jobs together (NB H&amp;F are now removing themselves from the tri-borough arrangement)</li> <li>• Brent and Ealing would perhaps want to collaborate on this.</li> <li>• There are CVS's in Brent and Ealing. There are many third sector organisations that offer skills and training and employment etc. It would be good if the three were co-ordinated on this to work strategically on the management of this. There may be another conversation that needs to take place with third sector organisations.</li> <li>• The OPDC has said before that it is co-ordinating technical colleges in the three boroughs so that they are co-ordinating services in the OPDC area.</li> <li>• The OPDC thought it was the initiative of the colleges – rather than this being the OPDC co-ordinating – so the colleges saw sense.</li> <li>• Some of this needs to go into policy E5- OPDC will work with partners and other stakeholders – towards a firmer and a systematic approach for smaller developers to proportionality sign up to – not just the major ones.</li> <li>• Who is letting the contracts? This is the time to sort this out.</li> <li>• Freeholders</li> <li>• You can't impose on a developer that if he employs x number of people that he must have x number of apprenticeships.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You can through legal agreements.</li> <li>• Perhaps with larger contractors – but it would be imposing a big burden on someone only employing 10 people.</li> <li>• The word major needs to be defined.</li> <li>• Housing Associations do a lot of work around skills, training and jobs and are amongst the developers in the area.</li> <li>• HAs watch the developers and work in partnership with them.</li> <li>• Issue raised about the overall number of homes and jobs.</li> <li>• The Mayor's office made the numbers up in the first place and the question for the OPDC now is can make that work.</li> <li>• On the training aspect– we have such interesting industries in PR, so we have this approach in OO of being environmentally friendly and dealing with waste management and energy production in PR. For that they could help local people, we should show off the attraction of our industries to try to catch attention and increase employability by developing particular skills for these industries. This could be really interesting.</li> <li>• This was the kind of thing that people were hoping that OPDC would have more imaginative role in.</li> <li>• Somewhere they are predicting the industries of the future.</li> <li>• Yes, this is the backdrop to this section - continuing business and commercial space; upgrading business services; creation of green industries; life sciences – linking with Imperial.</li> <li>• Re the offices (55,000 jobs) we having discussed is there anything more on the financial and business sectors will they still be with us in the next 20 years? It says very little on this. Are they confident about this?</li> <li>• The background document has a lot more to say on this and has identified some specific areas.</li> <li>• Re logistics expertise there – maybe they could help teach us on the green transportation we were talking about at the last meeting?</li> </ul>
--	---


