

**Notes from GUA Meeting 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016**  
**held at Pentecostal City Mission Church, Scrubs Lane**

**1. OPDC Report Review: Key findings and recommendations**

The meeting discussed the OPDC Report Review that was published by Fiona Fletcher Smith in late October 2016. It was agreed that the report did not address the key issues that GUA members have raised in their letter to Fiona and that these should be readdressed. Fiona had responded that she would be responding to the GUA separately. The following comments were made during the discussion:

- It was disappointing that the report didn't take on the issues of density, height and the quantum of the development. It rather concentrated on details on details over the land.
- There is emphasis on the lack of funding from the government. The Mayor needs to make a strong case to the government, so that the GLA does not pay for everything.
- This is a national transport issue and needs to be addressed by the government. We should support the OPDC to put pressure on acquiring governmental funding.
- The GUA has been successful so far addressing local planning policy issues. We should build on that.
- We need to focus on the planning issues. The OPDC is competent enough to fight its own battle over funding.
- We could take the GUA issues forward to the GLA regeneration committee.
- The suggestion for an additional representative from Hammersmith and Fulham on the Board is positive.
- The situation is asymmetric; developers have enormous resource and communities have no funding.
- The majority of the issues we raised have not been addressed.

The meeting agreed that EP should send a polite reminder to FFS asking her to respond to the key issues raised by the GUA that have not been addressed by the report.

GUA letter to Fiona:

[http://media.wix.com/ugd/4e0a01\\_c13937ddd62047a88d45d2dceff96bbd.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/4e0a01_c13937ddd62047a88d45d2dceff96bbd.pdf)

OPDC Review Report:

[http://media.wix.com/ugd/4e0a01\\_1bd8b81f1bac4542a14f1b47dff8c9c9.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/4e0a01_1bd8b81f1bac4542a14f1b47dff8c9c9.pdf)

**2. Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation**

The OPDC is consulting on its Community Infrastructure Levy, Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. RB introduced the subject for discussion and explained that the CIL is a tax on selected new building uses – by uses or by geographical area. These funds will be used to fund improvement, construction and maintenance of infrastructure in the OPDC area. The S106 agreements are to mitigate specific impacts arising from a development. The following key points were made during the discussion:

**Funding gap and charging rates**

- There is a huge funding gap between the level of infrastructure needed in the area as identified at the DIFS (1.5 billion) and amount that will be charged through CIL (380 million). The OPDC review report says that the level of infrastructure needed will be

2.5 billion. This raises concerns on whether the OPDC will be able to deliver the amount of social and community infrastructure needed.

- The charges rates are too low and do not take into account the note on the DIFS report that land values are highly to be very volatile and increase as development progresses.
- It is noted that planning applications are being submitted fast to the OPDC, especially for development in Scrubs Lane, prior to the setting of the CIL rates. The viability study is perhaps now out date

#### On Regulation 123

- It is not clear how and when money will be spent and it is surprising that there is no priorities set to consult on at this point. Social and community infrastructure should be identified as a key priority. There is concern that CIL will be spent on funding big transport projects and not social and community infrastructure.
- The regulation 123 should be amended to include health (new GP surgeries), education (new schools), play areas and public facilities. On transport, priority should be to regulate traffic movement and solve connectivity issues with the surrounding areas
- It is of particular concern that health is not included in the current list, especially given the fact that existing health facilities cannot cope with the amount of residents, while hospitals are being closed down
- It is not clear how the regulation 123 list fits with addressing environmental issues (noise and pollution) that will be continuous and possible compensation for residents affected during both the construction and development period.
- It should be clarified if the OPDC is expecting that developers are to include in their proposals community, social and health facilities through section 106 agreements.

#### Neighbourhood portion

- A proportion of 15% should be spent in consultation with the local community. This a requirement of Planning Guidance and it said that it can be used for development outside the area to support the development. OPDC should clarify a mechanism of how it will engage with the local communities.
- Neighbourhood forums to set their own 123 regulation list on how to spend the 25%.
- The local community should be involved in the negotiations for the section 106 agreements.

The meeting agreed that a model response could be produced based on the above comments to be used by groups and individuals to support them in their responses. Colin Lovell from Diocese of London said that he will be sending a draft response based on this discussion to be circulated amongst GUA members to help in the production of the model response.

### **3. Analysis of the responses to the Local Plan (Regulation 18)**

GUA workers have produced and presented an analysis and a summary of the responses to the Local Plan. EP briefly presented the documents focusing on the positive results that the

GUA has achieved. The analysis was well received by the meeting and it was said that this document can be used for the future round of consultations.

You can view both the summary and the analysis by visiting this link:

<http://grandunionalliance.wixsite.com/grandunionalliance/publications>