

# AGENDA

**Meeting**    **London Assembly (Plenary)  
(Extraordinary Meeting)**

**Date**        **Wednesday 17 December 2014**

**Time**        **1.30 pm**

**Place**        **Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's  
Walk, London, SE1 2AA**

Copies of the reports and any attachments may be found at  
[www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/whole-assembly)

Most meetings of the London Assembly and its Committees are webcast live at  
[www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/webcasts) where you can also view past meetings.

An Extraordinary meeting of the Assembly has been called, in accordance with Standing Order 1.7, to deal with the business listed below.

Roger Evans AM  
Chairman of the London Assembly

Jennette Arnold OBE AM  
Deputy Chair  
Tuesday 9 December 2014

## Further Information

If you have questions, would like further information about the meeting or require special facilities please contact: Rebeca Arnold, Committee Services Manager; Telephone: 020 7983 4421; Email: [rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk](mailto:rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk); Minicom: 020 7983 4458.

For media enquiries please contact: Alison Bell; Telephone: 020 7983 5769; Email: [alison.bell@london.gov.uk](mailto:alison.bell@london.gov.uk); Minicom: 020 7983 4458. If you have any questions about individual items please contact the author whose details are at the end of the report.

This meeting will be open to the public, except for where exempt information is being discussed as noted on the agenda. A guide for the press and public on attending and reporting meetings of local government bodies, including the use of film, photography, social media and other means is available at [www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Openness-in-Meetings.pdf).

There is access for disabled people, and induction loops are available. There is limited underground parking for orange and blue badge holders, which will be allocated on a first-come first-served basis. Please contact Facilities Management on 020 7983 4750 in advance if you require a parking space or further information.

Proper Officer: Mark Roberts, Executive Director of Secretariat.

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of the agenda, minutes or reports in large print or Braille, audio, or in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Si usted, o algùn conocido desea recibir una copia del order del dia, acta o informe en Braille o en su propio idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros llamando al teléfano 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico: [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Se você, ou algüem que conheça precisa uma cópia da ordem do dia, anotações ou relatorios em prensa grande ou Braille, ou em outra lingu, então por favour nos telephone em 020 7983 4100 ou e-mail [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Haddii ama ama qof aad taqaanid, uu ugu baahan yahay koobiga ajendhada, haddaladii ama warbixinta in far waaweyn loogu qoro ama farta qofka indoolaha akhrin karo, amaba luuqad kale, fadlan naga soo wac telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

Ta ba ri enikeni ti o ba ni ife ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk).

જો તમને અથવા તમે જાણતાં હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને એજન્ડા (કાર્યસૂચિ), મિનિટ્સ (ટૂંકી નોંધો) અથવા રિપોર્ટ્સ (અહેવાલો)ની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાયેલી કે બ્રેઈલમાં અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને 020 7983 4100 ઉપર ફોન અથવા [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) ઉપર અમને ઈ-મેઈલ કરો.

आपनि वा आपनार परिचित केउ यदि एजेन्डा, मिनिट वा रिपोर्टर एकाटि कपि बड् छापु वा ब्रेइल अथवा अन्य कान भाषाय पेटेते चान तबे दया करे आमामेदरके 020 7983 4100 ए नाम्पारे फोन करण वा [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk) ए ई-मेईले योगायोग करण ।

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਜਾਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਵਾਕਫ਼ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਵਿਅਕਤੀ ਨੂੰ, ਏਜੰਡੇ, ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ, ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਛਪਾਈ ਜਾਂ ਬਰੇਲ ਦੇ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਬੋਲੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਨੂੰ 020 7983 4100 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਇਸ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਈਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ : [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی فرد کو اس ایجنڈا کی کاپی، تفصیل یا رپورٹیں بڑے پرنٹ یا بریل یا کسی دوسری زبان میں درکار ہوں تو براہ کرم ہمیں 020 7983 4100 پر فون کیجئے یا درج ذیل ای میل پر رابطہ کیجئے [assembly.translations@london.gov.uk](mailto:assembly.translations@london.gov.uk)



Certificate Number: FS 80233

**Agenda  
London Assembly (Plenary)  
Wednesday 17 December 2014**

**1 Apologies for Absence and Chairman's Announcements**

To receive any apologies for absence and any announcements from the Chairman.

**2 Declarations of Interests (Pages 1 - 4)**

**The Assembly is recommended to:**

- (a) Note the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, as disclosable pecuniary interests;**
- (b) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s); and**
- (c) Note the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at Agenda Item 2) and to note any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s).**

**3 Proposal to Designate a Mayoral Development Area (Pages 5 - 38)**

Report of the Executive Director of Secretariat  
Contact: Ed Williams, ed.williams@london.gov.uk, tel: 020 7983 4399.

**The Assembly is recommended to:**

- (a) Put questions to Sir Edward Lister - Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning – and Victoria Hills, Director of the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation for Old Oak and Park Royal, on the Mayor's proposal to designate a Mayoral Development Area covering Old Oak and Park Royal; and**
- (b) Consider, in accordance with Section 197 of the Localism Act 2011, the Mayor's proposal to designate an area at Old Oak and Park Royal as a Mayoral Development Area, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.**

**4 Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the London Assembly will be the Mayor's Question Time meeting which will take place at 10.00am on Wednesday 21 January 2015 in the Chamber, City Hall.

**5 Any Other Business the Chairman Considers Urgent**

<b>Subject: Declarations of Interests</b>	
<b>Report to: London Assembly (Extraordinary Plenary)</b>	
<b>Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat</b>	<b>Date: 17 December 2014</b>
<b>This report will be considered in public</b>	

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report sets out details of offices held by Assembly Members for noting as disclosable pecuniary interests and requires additional relevant declarations relating to disclosable pecuniary interests, and gifts and hospitality to be made.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table below, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests<sup>1</sup>;**
- 2.2 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any disclosable pecuniary interests in specific items listed on the agenda and the necessary action taken by the Member(s) regarding withdrawal following such declaration(s) be noted; and**
- 2.3 **That the declaration by any Member(s) of any other interests deemed to be relevant (including any interests arising from gifts and hospitality received which are not at the time of the meeting reflected on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, and noting also the advice from the GLA's Monitoring Officer set out at below) and any necessary action taken by the Member(s) following such declaration(s) be noted.**

## 3. Issues for Consideration

- 3.1 Relevant offices held by Assembly Members are listed in the table overleaf:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Monitoring Officer advises that: Paragraph 10 of the Code of Conduct will only preclude a Member from participating in any matter to be considered or being considered at, for example, a meeting of the Assembly, where the Member has a direct Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in that particular matter. The effect of this is that the 'matter to be considered, or being considered' must be about the Member's interest. So, by way of example, if an Assembly Member is also a councillor of London Borough X, that Assembly Member will be precluded from participating in an Assembly meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about the Member's role / employment as a councillor of London Borough X; the Member will not be precluded from participating in a meeting where the Assembly is to consider a matter about an activity or decision of London Borough X.

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>
Tony Arbour AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Jennette Arnold OBE AM	Committee of the Regions
Gareth Bacon AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Bexley
John Biggs AM	
Andrew Boff AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Victoria Borwick AM	Member, Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea; Deputy Mayor
James Cleverly AM	Chairman of LFEPA; Chairman of the London Local Resilience Forum; substitute member, Local Government Association Fire Services Management Committee
Tom Copley AM	
Andrew Dismore AM	Member, LFEPA
Len Duvall AM	
Roger Evans AM	Committee of the Regions; Trust for London (Trustee)
Nicky Gavron AM	
Darren Johnson AM	Member, LFEPA
Jenny Jones AM	Member, House of Lords
Stephen Knight AM	Member, LFEPA; Member, LB Richmond
Kit Malthouse AM	Deputy Mayor for Business and Enterprise; Deputy Chair, London Enterprise Panel; Chair, Hydrogen London; Chairman, London & Partners; Board Member, TheCityUK
Joanne McCartney AM	
Steve O'Connell AM	Member, LB Croydon; MOPAC Non-Executive Adviser for Neighbourhoods
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM	
Murad Qureshi AM	Congress of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of Europe)
Dr Onkar Sahota AM	
Navin Shah AM	
Valerie Shawcross CBE AM	Member, LFEPA
Richard Tracey AM	Chairman of the London Waste and Recycling Board; Mayor's Ambassador for River Transport
Fiona Twycross AM	Member, LFEPA

[Note: LB - London Borough; LFEPA - London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority; MOPAC – Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime]

3.2 Paragraph 10 of the GLA's Code of Conduct, which reflects the relevant provisions of the Localism Act 2011, provides that:

- where an Assembly Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any matter to be considered or being considered or at
  - (i) a meeting of the Assembly and any of its committees or sub-committees; or
  - (ii) any formal meeting held by the Mayor in connection with the exercise of the Authority's functions
- they must disclose that interest to the meeting (or, if it is a sensitive interest, disclose the fact that they have a sensitive interest to the meeting); and

- must not (i) participate, or participate any further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting; or (ii) participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting

#### UNLESS

- they have obtained a dispensation from the GLA's Monitoring Officer (in accordance with section 2 of the Procedure for registration and declarations of interests, gifts and hospitality – Appendix 5 to the Code).

- 3.3 Failure to comply with the above requirements, without reasonable excuse, is a criminal offence; as is knowingly or recklessly providing information about your interests that is false or misleading.
- 3.4 In addition, the Monitoring Officer has advised Assembly Members to continue to apply the test that was previously applied to help determine whether a pecuniary / prejudicial interest was arising - namely, that Members rely on a reasonable estimation of whether a member of the public, with knowledge of the relevant facts, could, with justification, regard the matter as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.
- 3.5 Members should then exercise their judgement as to whether or not, in view of their interests and the interests of others close to them, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA. It remains the responsibility of individual Members to make further declarations about their actual or apparent interests at formal meetings noting also that a Member's failure to disclose relevant interest(s) has become a potential criminal offence.
- 3.6 Members are also required, where considering a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom they have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25 within the previous three years or from the date of election to the London Assembly, whichever is the later, to disclose the existence and nature of that interest at any meeting of the Authority which they attend at which that business is considered.
- 3.7 The obligation to declare any gift or hospitality at a meeting is discharged, subject to the proviso set out below, by registering gifts and hospitality received on the Authority's on-line database. The on-line database may be viewed here:  
<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/gifts-and-hospitality>.
- 3.8 If any gift or hospitality received by a Member is not set out on the on-line database at the time of the meeting, and under consideration is a matter which relates to or is likely to affect a person from whom a Member has received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25, Members are asked to disclose these at the meeting, either at the declarations of interest agenda item or when the interest becomes apparent.
- 3.9 It is for Members to decide, in light of the particular circumstances, whether their receipt of a gift or hospitality, could, on a reasonable estimation of a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, with justification, be regarded as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest. Where receipt of a gift or hospitality could be so regarded, the Member must exercise their judgement as to whether or not, they should participate in any given discussions and/or decisions business of within and by the GLA.

## **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 The legal implications are as set out in the body of this report.

## 5. Financial Implications

5.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
--

List of Background Papers: None
---------------------------------

Contact Officer: Rebecca Arnold, Committee Services Manager
---

Telephone: 020 7983 4421
--------------------------

E-mail: rebecca.arnold@london.gov.uk
--------------------------------------



# Subject: Proposal to Designate a Mayoral Development Area

**Report to: London Assembly (Extraordinary Plenary)**

**Report of: Executive Director of Secretariat**

**Date: 17 December 2014**

**This report will be considered in public**

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 The Assembly is asked to consider the Mayor's proposal to designate a Mayoral Development Area for Old Oak and Park Royal, and whether or not to reject the proposal.

## 2. Recommendation

**The Assembly is recommended to:**

- 2.1 **Put questions to Sir Edward Lister - Chief of Staff and Deputy Mayor for Planning - and Victoria Hills, Director of the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation for Old Oak and Park Royal, on the Mayor's proposal to designate a Mayoral Development Area covering Old Oak and Park Royal; and**
- 2.2 **Consider, in accordance with Section 197 of the Localism Act 2011, and make decisions as necessary on the Mayor's proposal to designate an area at Old Oak and Park Royal as a Mayoral Development Area, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 Section 197 of the Localism Act 2011 gives the Mayor powers to designate any area of land in Greater London as a Mayoral Development Area ("MDA") for the purposes of setting up a Mayoral Development Corporation ("MDC"). In relation to the proposal to designate a Mayoral Development area covering Old Oak and Park Royal, that process has now reached its final stage following previous consultations with statutory consultees, including the Assembly, on the proposed area to be designated and, amongst other matters, the powers to be exercised by the MDC established for the area.
- 3.2 At this final stage, the Act requires the Mayor to lay his proposals for designation of the area before the Assembly in order to afford it the opportunity to reject the proposed designation within the following 21 days. The Mayor may only proceed to designate the MDA if, after the 21 day "consideration period" has expired, the Assembly has not rejected his proposals.

- 3.3 Accordingly, formal proposals in relation to the designation of a MDA (“the Proposal”) have now been received from the Mayor, which the Assembly is asked to consider, as set out at **Appendix 1**. The area to be designated is shown on the plan attached.
- 3.4 In accordance with Section 197, the Assembly may reject the proposed designation by a two thirds majority of Members present and voting. Although a formal motion to reject the Proposal is not included in the Recommendations to this report, such a motion may be moved by any single AM during the meeting, and if seconded, will be considered and must be voted upon by the Assembly.

#### **4. Issues for Consideration**

- 4.1 Old Oak and Park Royal are two Opportunity Areas in north-west London. They straddle three borough boundaries: Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham. Park Royal is Europe’s largest industrial estate while Old Oak has been identified as an area of regeneration following on from the significant transport improvements arising from Crossrail and HS2 that will make the area a transport hub.
- 4.2 Between June and September 2014, the Mayor conducted a public consultation on his proposals to establish a MDC to lead on the planning and regeneration of Old Oak and Park Royal.
- 4.3 The Mayor’s consultation document set out the key objectives of the MDC, which included:
- To regenerate, develop and transform Old Oak to ensure the area becomes a major contributor to London’s economy, in a way that is sustainable and meets local needs;
  - To safeguard and plan for the regeneration of Park Royal as a Strategic Industrial Location, steer, help secure investment to support businesses and support the smooth transition of business and industrial relocations;
  - To resolve complex, cross-borough issues and plan in a way that includes an integrated approach to planning policy, planning decisions and Community Infrastructure Levy;
  - To support delivery of 24,000 new homes at Old Oak and 1,500 homes in appropriate locations in Park Royal;
  - To promote economic growth, job creation and enterprise with the potential for 55,000 new jobs at Old Oak and a further 10,000 new jobs at Park Royal;
  - To support delivery of all other infrastructure required to support such a significant level of people living, working and visiting the area;
  - To maximise opportunities presented by significant ownership of land and assets by transport authorities and public bodies, by co-ordinating the development of those assets;
  - To work with key stakeholders, service providers, businesses and the local community to ensure the regeneration of the area is accountable to Londoners; and
  - To respect the role and importance of the three local authorities whose boundaries overlap at Old Oak and Park Royal
- 4.4 Once established the Mayoral Development Corporation would take on various statutory powers relating to infrastructure, regeneration, land acquisitions –including Compulsory Planning Orders – streets, business and financial support. In setting up the MDC the Mayor can also choose whether or not to award additional powers related to planning and business rate relief for non-domestic rate

payers. In this instance the Mayor is minded to grant planning powers but not the power to grant business rate relief powers.

- 4.5 The boundary of a MDA defines the area in which the Corporation's powers, including its planning powers, would apply. A supplementary consultation was undertaken in November 2014 on a revised boundary for the Mayoral Development Area. The proposed Corporation would not be required to, and would most certainly not be expected to, take ownership of all land and assets within its boundary. The Corporation is not expected to be a major land-holding body, although there may be some transfers of land and assets owned by relevant public bodies.
- 4.6 The London Assembly's Planning Committee responded to the Mayor's consultation on behalf of the Assembly in September 2014. The full response can be found on the Assembly's website<sup>1</sup>.
- 4.7 The Committee's key comments were:
- There is overall support for the establishment of an MDC to meet the significant regeneration potential of the area;
  - Considerable investment will be needed to remake and upgrade the area's infrastructure and these objectives can best be realised through a focused regeneration vehicle with the requisite planning powers;
  - The Mayor must place specific emphasis on the need to protect and enhance the interests of existing businesses and residents as well as securing high quality sustainable development of the area;
  - The Committee expects the Mayor to expend significant effort to ensure that businesses, local residents and stakeholders are given sufficient time and opportunities to input their views into the planning process;
  - The MDC Board should include a community representative;
  - The Committee supports the principle for MDC determination of strategic planning applications and the delegation of smaller scale applications to the boroughs. Details of the respective types of development application and thresholds should be left to negotiation between the MDC and the boroughs;
  - It is logical for the MDC to prepare the comprehensive local plan for the MDC area including a Community Infrastructure Levy as the most effective way of delivering the substantial and long-term funding required to underpin the infrastructure required. However, this must be done in close consultation with the boroughs, and should undergo extensive community consultation; and
  - Local residents and the local business community (and in particular the small and medium sized businesses) need to have mechanisms by which their views can be canvassed and heard. There may be scope for a Communities Committee to be created and to have formal status within the governance structure of the MDC. Similar issues of local representation, transparency and accountability were discussed during the consultation stage of the Olympic Park MDC, which the Mayor is referred to.<sup>2</sup>
- 4.8 The Mayor is required to publish a statement giving reasons for any relevant matters on which the comments from the Assembly are not accepted. That statement is set out at Appendix 1 to this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.london.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s39722/06a%20-%20appendix%20to%20Old%20ak%20and%20PR%20report.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/20110413\\_Letter%20to%20Mayor\\_MDC.pdf](http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/20110413_Letter%20to%20Mayor_MDC.pdf)

## 5. Legal Implications

- 5.1 The main legal implications are set out in the body of the report. By laying his Proposal for the designation of the MDA before the Assembly, the Assembly is afforded a 21 day period (the consideration period) within which to reject the area's designation if it votes to reject by a two - thirds majority of AMs present and voting (abstentions are not included). A motion to reject the Proposal may be moved at the meeting in accordance with the procedure set out at Standing Order 3.22.
- 5.2 This is not a further round of consultation. If the consideration period has expired without the Assembly having rejected the Proposals, the Mayor may proceed to formally designate the area, and then must notify the Secretary of State of that fact and the proposed legal name of the Mayoral Development Corporation. The Mayor is not required to consult the Assembly on the MDC's name. The MDC is legally established by order of the Secretary of State made by statutory instrument and which is subject to the negative resolution procedure.

## 6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising from the report.

---

### List of appendices to this report:

**Appendix 1** – Letter from the Mayor to the Chairman of the Assembly dated 8 December 2014 and two related enclosures – a map indicating the proposed boundary of the Mayoral Development Area and the statement by the Mayor in response to the public consultation

<b>Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985</b>
--

List of Background Papers: None.
----------------------------------

Contact Officer:	Ed Williams, Head of Committee and Member Services
Telephone:	020 7983 4421
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:ed.williams@london.gov.uk">ed.williams@london.gov.uk</a>

## MAYOR OF LONDON

**Roger Evans AM**

Chair of the London Assembly  
City Hall  
The Queen's Walk  
More London  
London SE1 2AA

**Date:** 8 December 2014

Dear Roger

As you know, I have for some time been working with Government and local councils on how we might drive forward the scale of development to achieve the full regeneration potential identified for Old Oak and Park Royal Opportunity Areas. In June 2013 I published my Vision for Old Oak and in January 2014 I published the Further Alterations to the London Plan. Earlier this year I held a statutory public and stakeholder consultation on my proposals to designate the area as a Mayoral development area and to establish a Mayoral development corporation (MDC). My view is that a single, robust public body with direction and governance would be the most appropriate and effective means by which to deliver the Vision for Old Oak and Park Royal, which was jointly produced by the GLA, TfL and London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham.

The Localism Act 2011 ('the Act') has put in place the necessary legislative framework for the Mayor of London to designate Mayoral development areas leading to the creation of MDCs. I am hereby writing to you in accordance with Section 197(3)(e) of the Act to formally lay before the Assembly my finalised proposals to designate a Mayoral development area for Old Oak and Park Royal, leading to the creation of a MDC for that area. I propose that this body is called the "Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation" (OPDC).

The Act sets out a consultation and response procedure to be followed before an area can be designated and the MDC is given particular planning and non-domestic rating powers. A public consultation on my proposals to designate a Mayoral development area and establish a new MDC for Old Oak and Park Royal was held from 18 June-24 September 2014. In response to consultation responses received, the boundary of the proposed MDC was revised, and a further supplementary consultation was undertaken from 5-26 November 2014 on the revised boundary.

A report on the responses to and outcome of both consultations, including my response to representations made by the London Assembly and other consultees is enclosed. That report also contains my reasons for not accepting any comments made by the Assembly or the London boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham, as required by Section 197(3)(d) of the Act.

# MAYOR OF LONDON

My specific and finalised proposals for the designation of the area and its MDC are set out below. This letter also sets out a number of other background matters relevant to the Assembly's consideration.

## 1. The boundary of the Old Oak and Park Royal Mayoral development area

I formally propose that an area at Old Oak and Park Royal be designated as a Mayoral development area under section 197(1) of the Act, the precise boundary of which is shown on the enclosed map. The area encompasses:

- The Park Royal Industrial Estate;
- Stonebridge Park;
- Park Royal Cemetery (Acton Cemetery);
- The core development site at Old Oak;
- North Acton Underground Station;
- Willesden Junction Underground and Overground stations; and
- Wormwood Scrubs Common.

This boundary is the same as the revised boundary consulted on between 5-26 November 2014.

Following my formal designation of the area as a Mayoral development area, this map will be laid in Parliament by the Secretary of State as part of the order that will legally establish the OPDC. This boundary constitutes my formal proposal for the purposes of Section 197(3) (e) of the Act, which I am laying before the Assembly by means of this letter, and which the Assembly now has the opportunity to consider.

## 2. OPDC's Powers

I have decided that the OPDC should be the local planning authority for the whole of its area, and in relation to that area is to have all the functions and powers described in section 202 (1) to (5) of the Act. I have also decided that the Mayoral development corporation will not have powers to grant discretionary relief from non-domestic rates, as described in section 214 of the Act.

## 3. OPDC's Board

Schedule 21 of the Act makes provision for appointments, by the Mayor, to the MDC's Board, and for the terms of such appointments. The Board must consist of a minimum of six people. Under the Act appointments to the Board will be made by myself. The Board must consist of at least one elected member of each of the three relevant London borough councils (Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith & Fulham). I may also choose to appoint any other members to the Board as I consider appropriate.

I propose that the Board for the OPDC consists of the following members:

- Mayor (or chair designate subject to London Assembly confirmation)
- Elected Member Brent Council
- Elected Member Ealing Council
- Elected Member Hammersmith & Fulham Council
- Greater London Authority representative

# MAYOR OF LONDON

- Transport for London representative
- Department for Transport representative
- High Speed 2 representative
- Network Rail representative
- Chair of the MDC Planning Committee
- Local business community representative
- Residential community representative
- Expert regeneration representative
- Expert education representative
- Independent business representative

In appointing Board members I must have regard to the desirability of appointing a person who has experience, and has shown some capacity in a matter relevant to the carrying out of the Corporation's functions, and I must also be satisfied that the person will have no financial or other interest likely to affect prejudicially the exercise of that person's functions as a member. The appointment of Board members will be an open and transparent process.

At this stage it is not possible to predict how long the OPDC might be required. As such, I therefore do not wish to formalise an end date for the Corporation. The Act does not require me to set an end date, but it does require that I 'review, from time to time, the continuing existence of any Mayoral development corporation'. I therefore propose to conduct the first such review by April 2017 and after this at specific times which I consider it to be appropriate.

## 4. MDC Planning Committee

Three options for the planning were proposed as part of the public and stakeholder consultation:

- a single planning committee;
- a single committee but with an extra councillor sitting on the committee for the local authority in which the planning application is situated; and
- 3 planning sub-committees, one for each local authority area and with an extra councillor sitting on the committee for the local authority in which the planning application is situated

I propose that Option 1 should be adopted as the planning committee structure. It is considered that both Option 2 and 3 would result in complex structures that would fail to achieve a single and joined up approach across the Mayoral development area.

Each of the three London borough councils would have councillors as their representatives on the planning committee. The planning committee would also contain other appointed members drawn from the Board or stakeholders. The Chair of the planning committee would sit on the MDC's Board. Appointments to the planning committee would be carried out in a transparent manner and would have to be agreed by the Board. In appointing any non-council or non-Board members to the committee, the Act requires that I must consent to the appointment and also that any potential appointee has no financial or other interest likely to affect prejudicially the exercise of the person's functions as member. Representatives from the local resident and business community would be able to apply to be a member of the planning committee.

# MAYOR OF LONDON

## 5. Other matters

This letter constitutes the formal laying of my proposals for the designation of the Old Oak and Park Royal Mayoral development area before the Assembly for the purposes of section 197(3)(e) of the Act. It does not constitute a further consultation exercise. Rather, it marks the start of the 21 day 'consideration period' defined by section 197(5) of the Act. The Assembly will have the opportunity on 17 December to question Sir Edward Lister and Victoria Hills on the matter.

If this time period expires without the Assembly rejecting the proposal in accordance with 197(5)(b) of the Act, the conditions set out in section 197 (3) of the Act will have been fulfilled. I will then proceed to designate the Mayoral development area and publicise its designation, and will thereafter write to notify the Secretary of State. I will also confirm to the Secretary of State that the name of the MDC will be the 'Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation' (OPDC).

I look forward to hearing the outcome of the Assembly's consideration of my proposals for what will surely be one of the largest regeneration projects London has seen for decades. I have copied this letter to Nicky Gavron AM, chair of the Planning Committee, and to Mark Roberts, Executive Director of the Assembly Secretariat.

Yours ever,




**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London

Cc: Nicky Gavron AM, City Hall  
Mark Roberts, Executive Director of the Assembly Secretariat

Encs.





This page is intentionally left blank

---

# OLD OAK AND PARK ROYAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

STATEMENT BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON IN RESPONSE TO PUBLIC  
CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OLD OAK  
AND PARK ROYAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (OPDC)

8 DECEMBER 2014

MAYOR OF LONDON

COPYRIGHT

Greater London Authority  
8 December 2014

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

[www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk)

enquiries 020 7983 4100

<https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/general/old-oak-mayors-development-corporation>

Mail: [OldOakMDC@london.gov.uk](mailto:OldOakMDC@london.gov.uk)  
minicom: 020 7983 4458

---

# OLD OAK AND PARK ROYAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

**STATEMENT BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON IN RESPONSE TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION  
ON THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OLD OAK AND PARK ROYAL  
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (OPDC)**

**8 DECEMBER 2014**

---

**CONTENTS**

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>P.6</b>
<b>2 STATEMENT OF REASONS</b>	<b>P.11</b>
<b>3 RESPONSE TO OTHER CONSULTATION COMMENTS</b>	<b>P.28</b>
<b>4 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>P.42</b>
<b>5 APPENDICES</b>	<b>P.44</b>

# INTRODUCTION

## 1 Introduction

The Further Alterations to the London Plan identifies the Old Oak Opportunity Area as having the capacity to accommodate 24,000 new homes and 55,000 new jobs, and also the Park Royal Opportunity Area as having the capacity to accommodate 10,000 new jobs and 1,500 new homes. This capacity for development is linked to significant improvements in the transport network including delivery of a new High Speed 2 and Crossrail station, and the proposed London Overground stations.

Old Oak and Park Royal sit across three London borough boundaries of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham. To support delivery on this scale the Mayor identified the need for a single, robust plan with clear direction and governance. Driving forward this scale of development is of strategic London importance and for this reason the Mayor proposed the establishment of a new Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) for Old Oak and Park Royal that would plan for, and support, this scale of regeneration.

### 1.1 Consultation requirements

Section 197 of the Localism Act 2011 requires the Mayor to consult on a proposal to establish a Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC). The Act specifically requires consultation with the following bodies and persons:

- Roger Evans AM, the Chair of the London Assembly;
- the following constituency members of the London Assembly within whose Assembly constituency the proposed Mayoral Development Area will be located:
  - Kit Malthouse AM (London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham)

- Navin Shah AM (London Borough of Brent)
- Dr. Onkar Sahota AM, (London Borough of Ealing)
- the following Members of Parliament within whose parliamentary constituency the proposed Mayoral Development Area will be located:
  - Andy Slaughter (MP for Hammersmith)
  - Angie Bray (MP for Ealing Central and Acton)
  - Sarah Teather (MP for Brent Central)
- the three London borough Councils within whose areas the proposed Mayoral Development Area will sit:
  - Brent Council
  - Ealing Council
  - Hammersmith and Fulham Council
- Any other person whom the Mayor considers it appropriate to consult.

Section 197 of the Localism Act states that where the Mayor does not accept comments provided either by the London Assembly or the London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham, the Mayor must publish a statement giving his reasons for non-acceptance. In addition, the Mayor must also have regard to comments made in response by other consultees. This document satisfies that requirement.

This report includes the following sections:

- Method of consultation
- Overview of the consultation responses
- Statement of Reasons responding to comments made by the London Assembly and the London

- Boroughs of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham
- Response to other comments received

### 1.2 Method of consultation

As part of the Mayor’s proposal to establish a Mayoral Development Corporation two consultation exercises were carried out:

- The main public consultation ran from 18 June 2014 to 24 September 2014
- Following comments received during the main consultation the Mayor proposed two amendments to the boundary of the Mayoral Development Area and a supplementary consultation was carried out from 5 November 2014 to 26 November 2014

#### Main consultation

A detailed report, a proposed map and questionnaire were consulted on. The following consultation exercises were carried out:

- The above listed information was made available on the GLA website for public review
- Information was made available on TfL’s consultation website, including an interactive consultation tool that encouraged respondents to answer eight consultation questions, and gave the opportunity to provide any other comments
- A consultation email was sent to a database of (approximately 300) residents, business, local groups, public authorities and service providers. This consultation email provided detail on the consultation, the consultation timescales, and the process of providing comments either to the GLA or TfL
- The consultation was advertised on the TfL page of the Metro newspaper detailing where further information could be found and how to respond to the consultation

- A press release was issued by the Mayor of London on 24 June 2014 notifying people of the consultation
- 55,000 leaflets were posted out across the local area. Detailed consultation meetings were held with London Assembly members and the three London Councils of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham.
- Meetings were held with landowners; Government; and transport providers.
- Consultation events were held with locals and interested groups including:
  - Wells House Road Residents Association
  - Wellesley Estate Residents Association
  - College Park and Old Oak Residents Association
  - Island Triangle Residents Association
  - Grand Union Alliance
  - Friends of Wormwood Scrubs
  - Park Royal Business Group
  - Harlesden Area Forum
  - Old Oak Housing Association
  - Shaftesbury Avenue and Midland Terrace Residents Association (a meeting was offered but declined).

#### Supplementary consultation on proposed boundary amendment

A leaflet explaining the supplementary consultation was prepared and the following consultation exercises were carried out:

- A leaflet explaining the proposed changes to the proposed MDA boundary and the rationale for this approach was sent directly to all those that responded to the main consultation. 18 respondents to the main consultation did not provide any contact details and so these

- respondents could not be directly notified. A copy of this leaflet and map are appended to this report
- The information was made available on the consultation section of the GLA’s website.
- Adverts were placed in the following three local papers; Brent and Kilburn Times; Fulham Gazette and the Ealing Gazette. These adverts notified people of the consultation, explained the proposed changes to the Mayoral Development Area and provided detail on where additional information was available.

### 1.3 Overview of consultation responses


#### Main consultation

For the main consultation a total of 309 consultation responses were received. 211 of these responses were received via the online TfL consultation tool and 98 directly in writing to the GLA. The results in summary are:

- 95 respondents were in overall support
- 43 respondents were in overall support but did raise some specific questions, and/or recommend some changes to the proposal
- 135 respondents objected to the proposal
- 35 respondents were undecided

Responses to the main consultation were received from the following groups:

- 215 residents (a map showing the location is included in appendix 3)
- 36 businesses
- 35 responses from people representing local groups
- 18 public sector (including Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith & Fulham)
- 5 respondents that did not provide any details on who they were



Please note that in most cases respondents commented on more than one issue.

#### Supplementary consultation on proposed boundary amendment



For the supplementary consultation, a total of 247 consultation responses were received. The results in summary are:

- 4 respondents were in overall support of the proposed amendments
- 3 respondents were in overall support but did raise some specific questions
- 228 respondents specifically objected to the continued inclusion of Wormwood Scrubs within the proposed Mayoral Development Area. Of these respondents 201 provided their comments based on a pre-scripted email, which included a concern about splitting Wormwood Scrubs from the Linford Christie stadium and associated car park.

- 5 respondents solely opposed the proposed removal the Linford Christie stadium, the hospital and the prison.
- 9 respondents made neutral statements

Responses to the supplementary consultation were received from the following groups:

- 230 residents or people with a local interest
- 12 responses from people representing local groups
- 2 public sector (including Brent and Hammersmith & Fulham)
- 2 businesses
- 1 education provider



# STATEMENT OF REASONS



## 2 Statement of Reasons

In line with the requirements of section 197 of the Localism Act this section provides a breakdown of the comments received from the London Assembly and the three relevant London Boroughs and includes the Mayor’s response.

The London Assembly Planning Committee responded on behalf of the London Assembly. The London Assembly supported the overall principle of establishing an MDC to meet the significant regeneration potential of the area.

The following issues were raised by the three London Boroughs and the London Assembly:

- 2.1 Principle of an MDC and Alternative Governance Model
- 2.2 Anti-Localism concerns
- 2.3 Board composition
- 2.4 Conservation Area consents and proposals for enhancement
- 2.5 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 2.6 Community involvement
- 2.7 Detailed planning comments – density and building heights proposals
- 2.8 Detailed planning comments – local character
- 2.9 Detailed planning comments – infrastructure
- 2.10 Detailed planning comments – local employment
- 2.11 Heritage applications

- 2.12 Housing
- 2.13 London Assembly oversight of the MDC
- 2.14 MDC establishment and timescales of operation
- 2.15 MDC structure and resources
- 2.16 Minimising disruptions from development
- 2.17 Name of the proposed MDC
- 2.18 Non-designated heritage assets
- 2.19 Planning committee composition
- 2.20 Proposed MDC boundary
- 2.21 Proposed MDC objectives
- 2.22 Protection for existing industrial areas
- 2.23 Scheme of delegation and determining planning applications
- 2.24 Supplementary consultation
- 2.25 Transitional arrangements
- 2.26 Waste planning
- 2.27 Future liability

### 2.1 Principle of an MDC and alternative governance models

The London Borough of Brent and Ealing supported the principle of the proposed MDC, but highlighted a series of aspects that needed further work.

The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham objected to the principle of the proposed MDC and instead proposed an alternative governance model to support the regeneration of the area. The alternative model was a local authority led partnership with a board comprised of representatives from the GLA, TfL, local resident and business groups as well as representatives from the transport community and central government. The partnership would have some level of delegated decision making but key decisions would continue to reside individually with each of the three local Councils with a potential to deliver a joint Area Action Plan.

#### Mayor’s response

The Mayor has considered these responses and plans to proceed with the establishment of the MDC at Old Oak and Park Royal.

Upon review of the Hammersmith and Fulham’s alternative model, the following concerns were identified:

- Key decisions would continue to be made individually by each of the three local Councils that would increase complexity of decision making and timescales.
- The proposed arrangement would not sufficiently raise the profile of the area in line with its status
- It was not clear how the proposed partnership arrangement would be established within an appropriate timescale

- It was not clear how the proposed partnership would be resourced
- The proposed MDC is considered to be a more appropriate governance model for the area for the following reasons:
- The establishment of an MDC would represent a step change in the profile for this regeneration project and would help build confidence with central Government and the private sector. This approach is confirmed in the recently published Growth Task Force recommendations;
- The MDC would act as a single point of contact for Old Oak and Park Royal, giving clear leadership and direction for this nationally important regeneration project.
- The MDC would provide a dedicated team focussed solely on the planning, regeneration and promotion of this area;
- The MDC would co-ordinate all public authorities, service and transport providers and the private sector;
- The MDC would provide a catalyst for securing funding for strategic infrastructure investment;
- The MDC board and planning committee would create a single and streamlined decision taking function, ensuring timely and less bureaucratic decision making. The MDC would be able to address cross boundary issues, support the relocation of existing businesses and support infrastructure delivery; and
- The MDC would have statutory planning powers to enable the production of a holistic and robust planning policy framework to be put in place quickly covering both Old Oak and Park Royal. This would include a new Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL tariff generated by development within the boundary of the MDC would be focussed on infrastructure delivery in that area.

## 2.2 Anti Localism concerns

Hammersmith and Fulham Councils response highlighted the desire to devolve more power to local residents, giving them a greater say in policy formulation and delivery. Hammersmith and Fulham Council expressed concern that the establishment of an MDC would result in a more centralised approach with less local accountability.

### Mayor's response

The proposed MDC structure supports the requirements of the Localism Act 2011. In addition, the Mayor is keen to further bolster local involvement by including local people on the MDC Board and giving the opportunity for local people to sit on the MDC Planning Committee. It is also proposed to establish a Community Charter that would commit the MDC to community consultation with local people. This Community Charter would be prepared and agreed in collaboration with local groups.

## 2.3 Board composition

Brent and Ealing Council requested that there should be representatives from the local residential and business community on the MDC Board.

Ealing Council also proposed that there would also need to be a Senior Officers group that the MDC should report to.

Hammersmith and Fulham Council requested at least two representatives on the MDC Board. Hammersmith and Fulham Councils response also objected to any unelected representatives sitting on the MDC board.

All four of the London Assembly representations stated that the Old Oak and Park Royal MDC

should have greater local accountability within its governance structures. Steven Knight (Assembly Member) stated that elected representatives from each of the affected boroughs should sit on both the MDC Board and planning committee and that it may be appropriate to adjust the make-up of the Board and committees to reflect the geographical coverage of the MDC, giving greater representation to those boroughs that are most affected. Nicky Gavron (Assembly Member), on behalf of the London Assembly Labour Group, also stated that the Old Oak and Park Royal MDC Board and planning committee should have a formal place for community representation and that in particular, the MDC's planning committee should be configured in such a way that results in genuine influence for the local authorities. Nicky Gavron (Assembly Member), in her response on behalf of the London Assembly planning committee raised similar concerns in respect of local accountability, stating that there should be significant efforts made by the MDC to ensure that businesses, local residents and stakeholders are adequately consulted on an engaged into the planning process. Further, the London Assembly Planning Committee also stated that the Mayor should consider commissioning a short piece of academic research to objectively assess the LLDC's planning committee to inform planning decisions in the Old Oak and Park Royal MDC. Navin Shah (Assembly Member) also supported the perspective that there should be genuine consultation with residents and businesses in the area and that there should be a formal place for community and business representation within the MDC on either the MDC Board or Planning Committee. Navin Shah (Assembly Member) also stated that the three boroughs should be adequately represented within the MDC governance structure and treated as equal partners.

### Mayor's response

Schedule 21 of the Localism Act 2011 makes provision for appointments, by the Mayor, to the Corporation's Board, and for the terms of such appointments. The Board must consist of a minimum of six people. Appointments to the Board will be made by the Mayor. The Chair of the Board must be appointed directly by the Mayor. The Board must consist of at least one elected member of each of the three relevant London Councils (i.e. Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith & Fulham). The Mayor may also choose to appoint any other members to the Board as he considers appropriate. In response to comments received during consultation with the following additional Board members are proposed:

- One local residential representative
- One local business representative
- The Chair of the MDC planning committee
- One Network Rail representative
- One High Speed 2 representative
- One un-conflicted independent business representative

As a result, it is proposed the MDC Board will include the following:

- Mayor (or chair designate subject to London Assembly confirmation)
- Elected Member Brent Council
- Elected Member Ealing Council
- Elected Member Hammersmith & Fulham Council
- Greater London Authority representative
- Transport for London representative
- Department for Transport representative
- High Speed 2 representative
- Network Rail representative
- Chair of the MDC Planning Committee
- Local business community representative

- Residential community representative
- Expert regeneration representative
- Expert education representative
- Independent business representative

In appointing Board members the Mayor must have regard to the desirability of appointing a person who has experience, and has shown some capacity in a matter relevant to the carrying out of the Corporation's functions, and must also be satisfied that the person will have no financial or other interest likely to affect prejudicially the exercise of that person's functions as a member.

With regard to LBHF having two representatives on the MDC Board it is considered that one elected member from each authority, bolstered by the local community and business representation, provides appropriate and sufficient representation for authorities to represent their communities. With regard to unelected representation from the business, education and transport sectors, it was considered that such representatives would provide useful experience and expertise to the Board and should therefore remain.

It is proposed that there would be a Senior Officers group that the MDC team would bring reports and work to for review and discussion.

With regard to the specific issues raised on the planning committee, please see paragraph 2.13.

## 2.4 Conservation Area designation and proposals for enhancement

Hammersmith and Fulham Council stated that the status of existing Conservation Areas is unclear as part of the MDC proposal and that the Council should retain powers for conservation area designation.

Mayor's response

Should the MDC be established, it would take on the role of the local planning authority, which includes the power to designate conservation areas. The MDC as local planning authority would exercise its functions subject to the normal duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. To ensure comprehensive planning across the proposed Mayoral development area it is important to ensure that conservation area designation is appropriately considered and addressed as part of this process by the MDC.

## 2.5 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Brent Council stated that transitional arrangements for CIL should not apply in Brent as under regulation 63A of the CIL Regulations if, before the MDC becomes the charging authority for the area, a London Borough Council: (a) had in place a charging schedule approved under section 213 of the Planning Act 2008; and (b) granted planning permission for a development, or received or issued a notice of chargeable development in relation to a development under regulation 64 or 64A of the CIL 2010 Regs; then that London Borough Council shall be entitled to receive the CIL for the development to which planning permission or notice of chargeable development relates – as would be the case with Brent. In particular, the London Borough of Brent requested greater clarity on the transitional arrangements.

Ealing Council has requested that they remain the CIL charging and collecting authority for North Acton.

Ealing Council has also noted that in setting a future CIL levy for industrial and other employment uses within the Mayoral development area, that the MDC should have due regard for the viability and should not stifle development.

Hammersmith and Fulham Council requested that they influence the prioritisation of expenditure raised by the CIL charge. The Council also highlighted the need to be involved in the preparation of the Development Infrastructure Funding (DIF) study.

Mayor's response

As set out in paragraph 9.12 of the consultation report, the intention is that the Corporation would become the local planning authority for the area and in accordance with Section 206(2) of the Planning Act 2008 would therefore also become the charging authority for its area. It is proposed that should the MDC become the local planning authority it would start the statutory process of consulting on and adopting its own CIL. In the interim period before the MDC adopts its own CIL, the MDC would not adopt, or apply, existing borough CILs. Instead, the MDC would use section 106 agreements to secure financial contributions from applications and the relevant CIL and section 106 regulations would apply to this process. For any applications determined by a local authority prior to MDC Planning Functions Order come into effect, CIL monies would continue to be paid to that authority, in accordance with Regulations 63A and 64A of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Should the proposed MDC Planning Functions Order come into force, the MDC would become the plan making authority for the entire Mayoral development area, and consequently the CIL charging authority. In setting a future CIL the MDC would work closely with the boroughs to agree an appropriate CIL level across the Mayoral development area. The MDC would prepare its CIL in line with the CIL regulations. In doing so the MDC would be very mindful of existing CIL levels for these land uses and the need to ensure that future CIL levels do not adversely impact on development viability.

Decisions on the expenditure of CIL would be made by the MDC Board, which would have representatives from the three local Councils.

Over the last 12 months officers from all of the three local Councils are already closely involved in the preparation of the Development Infrastructure Funding (DIF) study and will continue to be.

## 2.6 Community involvement

The London Assembly, Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham Council all raised questions about how the local community would be involved in the future planning and decision making in the MDC.

Mayor's response

Community participation is a very important tenet of the future planning for Old Oak and Park Royal. Should the MDC be established it is proposed that representatives from both the local business community and the local residential community will be offered a seat on the MDC board and so will be closely involved in all future decision making. This approach would also ensure transparency of decision making with the local community. In addition, the MDC

would prepare and agree a Community Charter in collaboration with the local community. This Charter would commit the MDC to a series of meetings with local people on a regular basis to ensure local people are given opportunities to feed into the future planning of the area. The Charter would be reviewed on a yearly basis.

## 2.7 Detailed planning comments – density and building heights proposals

Navin Shah (Assembly Member) raised concerns about creating a 'mini-Manhattan' at Old Oak and Park Royal and stated that development should be low rise and of a contemporary design.

Mayor's response

Residential density is guided by the London Plan (2011) with further housing detail in the GLA Housing SPG (2012). The OAPF will refine this guidance for the Old Oak and Park Royal alongside undertaking comprehensive infrastructure planning. Further detailed guidance for the location and distribution of densities across the area will be developed during the production of the Local Plan alongside infrastructure planning. The Mayor considers this to provide the appropriate guidance framework to deliver densities that contribute to the delivery of successful and sustainable mixed-use neighbourhoods.

## 2.8 Detailed planning comments – local character

Nicky Gavron (Assembly Member), in her comments on behalf of the London Assembly Labour Group raised the need for improving connections between new development and the existing nearby communities.

Ealing Council pointed out that there is an existing local character that has developed over many years that includes historic residential and that future development needs to respect existing areas.

Mayor's Response

The Mayor envisages that the OAPF, and local plan, will include guidance and policy to ensure positive aspects of existing character are reflected in the placemaking of future development. The OAPF will provide place-based guidance for the areas within the proposed MDC. Should the MDC be established, the Local Plan will provide further guidance relating to character and context.

## 2.9 Detailed planning comments – infrastructure

Steven Knight (Assembly Member) noted the importance of securing necessary social infrastructure to support the needs of development and for such facilities to be delivered in a timely manner. This perspective was shared by Navin Shah (London Assembly) who notes that social infrastructure is often neglected, or even scrapped on the grounds of commercial viability. The London Borough of Brent stated that Willesden Junction station should not have a reduction in commuter services and that the station also requires considerable early improvements and investment. The London Borough of Brent also requested support from the MDC and the wider GLA/TfL family in lobbying strongly for Crossrail trains to stop at Wembley Central.

Mayor's response

Work is already underway to identify the level of social infrastructure required to support the development at Old Oak to ensure this

is properly planned for and delivered. TfL are currently in the process of drafting a Transport Study for Old Oak and Park Royal, which is looking at potential improvements at Willesden Junction. The GLA will continue to engage with Brent Council regarding the potential for a Crossrail station at Wembley Central.

## 2.10 Detailed planning comments – local employment

Nicky Gavron (Assembly Member), in her comments on behalf of the London Assembly Labour Group, and Ealing Council noted the valuable role that affordable workspace and start-ups can play in the local economy and the need to promote such uses. The London Borough of Brent stated that it was concerned that development at Old Oak will impact negatively on nearby town centres and that to mitigate any potential negative impacts a commitment is sought towards significant on-going High Street investment in Brent.

Mayor's response

The Mayor considers the delivery of new, fit-for-purpose employment floorspace and the protection of viable employment floorspace to be critical to the long-term success of Old Oak and Park Royal. It is envisaged that the OAPF will provide strategic guidance for the delivery of new employment floorspace to meet demand and protect existing employment floorspace in identified locations in consultation with land owners and tenants. Detailed guidance for the management of employment floorspace and securing local employment, training and apprenticeships would be set out in the Local Plan. Should a MDC be established, impact on nearby town centres and potential mitigation mechanisms would be considered as part of evidence work in support of a Local Plan.

## 2.11 Heritage Applications

Hammersmith and Fulham Council requested that Listed Building Consent applications would be best dealt with by the local Councils and that there could be confusion in terms of the approach to Conservation Area Consent.

Mayor's response

Once the MDC Planning Functions comes into force the MDC would become the local planning authority for the area which includes responsibility for heritage planning. The MDC as local planning authority would exercise its functions subject to the normal duties of the relevant Acts.

With Wormwood Scrubs prison removed from the proposed MDC boundary, there are no longer any listed buildings within the Hammersmith and Fulham part of the MDC area.

In agreeing a future scheme of delegation with the local Councils, as to which planning functions the local Council would carry out in the name of the MDC, there may be an opportunity to consider the role of the local Council in performing this function, so long as this fits within the overall plan for the Mayoral development area. The scheme of delegation would be agreed between the MDC and the local Councils separate to the Planning Functions Order. A future agreement between the MDC and the local Councils may include an agreement on how the MDC may utilise existing heritage expertise within the local Councils.

The previous requirement for Conservation Area Consent for demolition of a building in a conservation area has been abolished and replaced with a requirement for planning permission. The fact that it is now possible to make a single application for planning

permission for the demolition of an existing building and its replacement with another underlines the reasons why it is sensible for control over demolition within conservation areas to lie with the local planning authority.

## 2.12 Housing provision

Both Hammersmith and Fulham and Ealing Council raised concerns about the need for development at Old Oak to deliver affordable housing. Their response also highlighted the impact that international investors can have on delivery of new homes for Londoners and that conversations with developers need to be transparent to maximise affordable housing delivery, which was reciprocated in Brent Council's response.

The London Assembly Planning Committee and Labour Group highlighted the need for the MDC to provide sufficient numbers of types of affordable housing and secure high quality residential development. Steven Knight (London Assembly) also stated that the Mayor must ensure that a sufficient proportion of new homes are made available to local residents at prices they can afford. The London Assembly Labour Group stated that the MDC's local plan should require that 50% of all new homes should be affordable.

Navin Shah (London Assembly) also promoted the importance of affordable housing and particularly the challenges of securing family sized affordable accommodation within high rise developments.

Brent Council also stated that there was no reference to the treatment of New Homes Bonus and that they wanted reassurance that this would continue to be paid to the relevant authority to allow for the delivery of essential services.

Mayor's response

Should the MDC be established it would become the local planning authority for the area and would prepare a Local Plan. The Local Plan would include planning policies on housing, affordable housing and place-making. These policies would be in general conformity with the London Plan.

In terms of the concerns relating to foreign investors, recognising that this issue is not unique to a single part of London, the Mayors Housing team is considering this issue at a pan London level. The MDC would give due consideration to implementing any policy recommendations from the Mayor on this issue. Any development management negotiations regarding the delivery of affordable housing will be reflected in the relevant planning reporting documents.

The MDC will continue to engage with the local authorities on the issue of the payment of New Homes Bonus monies.

### 2.13 London Assembly oversight of the MDC

The London Assembly's Planning Committee has requested an oversight role in scrutinising the proposed MDC.

Mayor's response

The proposed MDC would be a functional body and so the role of the London Assembly in scrutinising the Mayor's functional bodies generally would operate in the normal way, including scrutiny of its operations and budget. It is suggested that a sensible programme of scrutiny be agreed.

### 2.14 MDC establishment and timescales of operation

Steven Knight (London Assembly) stated that it is a matter of concern that the Mayor has not set an end date for the proposed MDC, as this might result in planning powers being taken away from boroughs in perpetuity.

Mayor's response

The work to secure the future regeneration for Old Oak and Park, as set out in the Further Alterations to the London Plan, is likely to take decades. At this stage it is not possible to predict how long the Corporation might be required. As such, the Mayor therefore does not wish to formalise an end date for the Corporation. The Localism Act 2011 does not require the Mayor to set an end date, but it does require that the Mayor 'review, from time to time, the continuing in existence of any Mayoral Development Corporation'. The Mayor proposes to conduct the first of such reviews by April 2017 and after this at such intervals as he considers appropriate.

### 2.15 MDC structure and resources

Steven Knight (London Assembly) stated that it is important the long-term transformation of the area is not put at risk by any uncertainty over its future income stream, noting that in the case of the LLDC, funding that had originally been allocated from central Government is now being withdrawn and the Mayor has been clear that outside investment will be sought to help finance the MDC, opportunities for this may be limited.

Mayor's response

A structure and resource plan have been prepared to ensure effective operation of the

MDC, which would be funded by the GLA in the early years. This would be approved by the Mayor as part of any decision to proceed with the establishment of the MDC. It is anticipated that the MDC would generate income from planning application fees and pre-application advice (subject to satisfactory amendments to existing legislation). The proposed OPDC will be difference in scale and operation to the LLDC. The Mayor envisages a more streamlined organisation whose primary function is to deliver the planning framework and drive forward regeneration.

### 2.16 Minimising disruptions from development

The London Assembly Planning Committee highlighted a concern that the scale of development could have a potentially negative impact on existing communities both during construction and once development has been completed. The London Borough of Brent requested that in the future planning for the area, consideration is given to the provision of a distribution centre in Park Royal to alleviate freight.

Mayor's response

It is very important that any disruption during both construction and the end-state are carefully planned to minimise negative impacts. Should the MDC be established it would work closely with TfL and the local Councils to prepare detailed construction logistics and transport plans to minimise disruption on the local and wider area. This would consider the potential for a distribution centre in Park Royal. Early planning work has started through the Vision 2013 document.

### 2.17 Name of the proposed MDC

Ealing Council preferred the name "Old Oak Common and Park Royal Development Partnership" because it felt it to be less laden with the legacy of the LLDC and would emphasise the partnership between the GLA, TfL, Network Rail and the boroughs.

Mayor's response

It is proposed to use the name Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC). Alternatives were considered but it is felt that the name originally consulted on is sufficiently succinct and clear to narrate to the wider public the ambitions for the area.

### 2.18 Non-designated heritage assets

Hammersmith and Fulham Council has stated that the status of Buildings of Merit and responsibility for management of the Local Register within the proposed MDC area is unclear.

Mayor's response

Should the MDC be established, the existing adopted development plans would still form part of the development plan for the proposed Mayoral development area and as such this would include the local register, which forms part of the existing development plan.

### 2.19 Planning Committee composition

Brent and Ealing Council both stated that of the three planning committee options presented as part of the main MDC consultation, Option 1 was their preferred option. Brent Council noted that there should be an increase in the proportion of locally elected members on the planning committee.

Hammersmith and Fulham Council stated that of the three planning committee options presented as part of the main MDC consultation, the Councils preference was for Option 3 and that Hammersmith and Fulham Council should have 3 members sitting on the committee.

The London Assembly Planning Committee sought assurances that the views of local people are canvassed and heard as part of the Planning Committee decisions

The London Assembly Planning Committee requested the Mayor to commission some additional research into the optimal arrangement for a future planning committee.

Mayor's response

Option 1 is the option preferred by two of the three boroughs concerned, and it is proposed that Option 1 should be adopted as the planning committee structure. It is considered that both Option 2 and 3 would result in complex structures that would fail to achieve a single and joined up approach across the Mayoral Development Area.

As set out in the main consultation report, Planning Committee option 1 proposed 'A single planning committee determining planning applications for the entire Old Oak and Park Royal area. The chair (or designate) of the Corporation board would chair the planning committee. The Committee would include six additional members including one Councillor from each of the three London borough councils.'

Each of the three London borough councils would have a councillor as their representatives on the planning committee. This is considered sufficient to ensure that the views of the boroughs are represented.

The planning committee would also contain other appointed members drawn from the Board or stakeholders. The Chair of the planning committee would sit on the MDC's Board. Appointments to the planning committee would be carried out in a transparent manner and would have to be agreed by the Board. In appointing any non-council or non-Board members to the committee, the Act requires that the Mayor must consent to the appointment and also that any potential appointee has no financial or other interest likely to affect prejudicially the exercise of the person's functions as member. Representatives from the local resident and business community would be able to apply to be a member of the planning committee.

As part of researching the proposed MDC, GLA officers have discussed potential Planning Committee arrangements with the London Legacy Development Corporation and the local Councils of Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham. In addition, as part of the main consultation people were specifically asked to comment on the proposed planning committee options. Given the level of research carried out in considering the various Planning Committee options, the Mayor does not propose to commission a specific piece of additional research.

The views of local people would be heard as part of the preparation of both the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and the Local Plan. These policy documents would be used to inform the determination of planning applications. In addition, the local community would be consulted as part of the planning application determination process and these views would be presented to the Planning Committee.

## 2.20 Proposed MDC Boundary

Brent Council requested that the Northfields site should be removed from the proposed MDC boundary.

Hammersmith and Fulham Council requested that Wormwood Scrubs, Wormwood Scrubs Prison, the Linford Christie Stadium, Hammersmith Hospital, Queen Charlotte's and Chelsea Hospital be removed from the proposed MDC Boundary.

Mayor's response

It is proposed to exclude land to the west of the A406, located in the London Boroughs of Brent and Ealing. This land includes the industrial areas of Northfields, Water Road, Abbeydale Road, Queensbury Road, North Circular Road, Brent Crescent and Park Avenue. This area is considered to be part of the Councils' emerging regeneration plans for Alperton.

It is proposed to remove Hammersmith Hospital Queen Charlotte's and Chelsea Hospital, Wormwood Scrubs prison and the Linford Christie stadium from the MDC boundary as it is recognised that these three sites relate more closely to communities to the south of Wormwood Scrubs and development proposals around White City and Wood Lane.

It is not proposed to remove Wormwood Scrubs from the boundary. Wormwood Scrubs is green lung that provides people and wildlife with the opportunity to enjoy green amenity space in central London. Wormwood Scrubs is proposed to be kept as part of the proposed Mayoral Development area. A new High Speed 2 and Crossrail station is planned on the northern boundary of the Scrubs, which would be a catalyst for the significant regeneration to the land immediately to the north. As such it is very

important both to mitigate potential impacts and also to prepare a plan for the area that could allow for sensitive enhancements to the Scrubs in line with the requirements of the Wormwood Scrubs Act.

This approach of having a clear long term planning framework that considers Old Oak, the Scrubs and how it relates to existing communities is important and necessary to mitigate development impacts. The Wormwood Scrubs Act would not be altered and the Wormwood Scrubs Charitable Trust (WSCT) would continue to govern the Scrubs.

It is important to note that neither the proposed MDC or anyone else can do anything to the Scrubs without the express permission of the WSCT. The MDC team would work closely with the WSCT, and the local community, to inform any future planning of the Scrubs. Any proposals for the Scrubs would be in line with the requirements of the Wormwood Scrubs Act.

## 2.21 Proposed MDC Objectives

Brent and Ealing Council suggested several minor changes that could be made to the regeneration objectives, and Nicky Gavron (Assembly Member), in her response on behalf of the London Assembly planning committee, and the London Assembly Labour Group made the following suggestions:

- To protect and enhance the interests of existing businesses and residents
- Securing a high quality sustainable development
- Ensure quality connections into the surrounding area
- Identify support for a better connection from Crossrail onto the West Coast Mainline

- Retain waste management facilities to safeguard London's waste management requirements
- Ensure affordable housing provision with a mix of tenures
- Careful planning of the transitional arrangements
- Minimise disruption to existing residents
- Include local people and businesses in consultation and planning
- Ensure transparent decision making

#### Mayor's response

The statutory objective for the MDC is to secure the regeneration of the area, as set out in the Localism Act. The MDC Board will need to ratify the final set of objectives and in doing so the Board will have regard to the detailed objectives consulted on and the comments received during the public consultation.

In particular, when setting the final set of objectives the MDC board would be asked to recognise the importance of protecting Wormwood Scrubs as a leisure and recreation space as per the Wormwood Scrubs Act. The objectives may include:

- Regenerate, develop and transform Old Oak to ensure the area becomes a major contributor to London's position, in a way that is sustainable, meets local needs and supports the strategic long-term priorities in the Mayor's London Plan (Further Alterations to the London Plan) and the Old Oak a Vision for the Future;
- Respect the role and importance of the three local authorities whose boundaries fall within the boundary of the proposed MDC, including assisting them in carrying out the duties and functions that remain their responsibility within the area.
- Work with key stakeholders, service providers and the local community to ensure the

- regeneration of Old Oak and Park Royal is accountable to Londoners, and is consistent with the principles of localism;
- Safeguard and plan for the regeneration of Park Royal as a Strategic Industrial Location, ensuring investment that will improve existing operations, maximise the area's industrial potential, and support the smooth transition of business and industrial relocations;
- Plan for Old Oak and Park Royal in a strategic and holistic way that includes an integrated approach with the boroughs planning policy, planning decisions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- Maximise local and regional connections that will see Old Oak become the most connected station in London and the South East, and support delivery of, a new station on the Great West Mainline that would serve Crossrail 1, a new High Speed 2 (HS2) station, future London Overground station(s), local public transport including buses, cycling and highway improvements;
- Support delivery of 24,000 new homes at Old Oak and 1,500 across the Park Royal gateways including a mix of affordable, tenures and sizes;
- Promote economic growth and job creation with potential for 55,000 additional jobs at Old Oak and 10,000 new jobs at Park Royal;
- Ensure world class architecture, place making and urban design that deliver a well-connected, high quality part of London;
- Maximise opportunities presented by significant ownership of land and assets by transport authorities and public bodies, by co-ordinating the strategic development and stewardship of those assets; and
- Build confidence in Old Oak and Park Royal and attract long term investment by promoting it as a significant development opportunity.

## 2.22 Protection for enhance existing industrial areas

The London Assembly Planning Committee and Labour Group highlighted the important role of existing industrial land in the Park Royal area and its important role in the London economy.

#### Mayor's response

Should the MDC be established, it would prepare a Local Plan that would seek to secure the long term protection and regeneration of this industrial land. The MDC would also work closely with existing businesses in preparing future plans. As noted in paragraph 2.5 above, it is proposed that a local business representative would have a seat on the MDC board.

## 2.23 Scheme of Delegation and determining planning applications

Brent and Ealing Council stated that the proposed inclusion of the caveat within the draft scheme of delegation enabling the MDC to determine any planning applications deemed appropriate, would serve to create uncertainty both with developers and the planning service and that this has the potential to cause disruption.

Ealing Council has stated that their support for the proposed scheme of delegation is subject to confirmation that planning applications in North Acton would be delegated to Ealing Council for determination, aside from applications related to development that comprises new and altered vehicle, rail, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, including but not limited to new roads, bridges and tunnels, which would be determined by the MDC.

The London Assembly Planning Committee noted that the final scheme of delegation would need to be agreed with the local Councils.

#### Mayor's response

The Mayor recognises these concerns about creating unnecessary confusion for applicants and the local community. The inclusion of any such caveat, as mentioned above, would need to be individually agreed with each of local Councils.

It is not proposed to change to the arrangement, as described above, that all planning applications in North Acton would continue to be determined by Ealing Council.

## 2.24 Supplementary consultation

Hammersmith and Fulham Council supported the proposed removal of Wormwood Scrubs Prison, Hammersmith Hospital and Linford Christie Stadium from within the proposed Mayoral Development Area, however, objected to the continued inclusion of Wormwood Scrubs on the following grounds:

- Concerns that developers may consider Wormwood Scrubs provides sufficient open space to support development proposals and that this may result in the failure to provide adequate open space to the north of the Grand Union Canal;
- Insufficient clarity regarding the relationship between the Wormwood Scrubs Charitable Trust and the MDC and the Trust's role in managing the Scrubs;
- Local support for Hammersmith and Fulham Council to continue its role as the Local Planning Authority for Wormwood Scrubs.

The London Borough of Brent supported the removal of Area 1 (in and around Northfields).

Mayor's response

Please refer to section 2.20 above for a detailed response.

The Mayor welcomes the Borough's support and looks forward to continuing to work together in delivering the regeneration of Old Oak and Park Royal.

## 2.25 Transitional arrangements

The London Assembly Planning Committee has requested that any transitional arrangements should be clear to avoid any confusion for the local community, applicants and the local Councils.

Mayor's response

Should the MDC be established, there would be a requirement to put in place clear transitional arrangements. These transitional arrangements would be secured through the Establishment and Planning Functions Order. Early discussions on these potential transitional arrangements are underway with the local Councils. It is important that these transitional arrangements are clear and avoid any confusion for the local community, local Councils and applicants.

## 2.26 Waste planning

Brent and Ealing Council stated that the production of a separate waste plan that is not consistent with the West London Waste Plan (WLWP) would not meet the legal requirement of the Duty to Cooperate. Brent Council also noted that should the MDC progress a separate waste plan, the waste apportionment targets in the Further Alteration to the London Plan would

need to be reviewed and an apportionment calculated for the MDC area. The MDC would then need to ensure this apportionment could be met without impacting on the apportionment targets and wider strategic policy approach to waste in the WLWP.

Hammersmith and Fulham Council stated that the Councils apportionment target is currently met through the EMR and Powerday waste sites, which lie within the boundary of the proposed MDC. The Council has requested that the MDC should therefore take responsibility for the Councils waste apportionment target in full and to fund the relocation of these uses outside of the Borough.

Nicky Gavron (Assembly Member), on behalf of the London Assembly Planning Committee, stated that waste management facilities should be retained, with scope to be developed further as London's waste management demands require.

Mayor's response

Should the MDC be established it would take on planning powers and would become the waste planning authority for the MDA. A future MDC Local Plan would have to plan for waste in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and would be prepared in cooperation with the boroughs in the West London Waste Authority area (the West London Waste Plan went through Examination in Public in summer 2014). How future waste apportionment targets are allocated across different local planning authorities would be agreed during the preparation of a future London Plan. This could include the potential for discussions with other local authorities to deal with waste apportionment and/or jointly produce waste plans and pool waste sites.

## 2.27 Future liability and maintenance costs

Brent Council has raised questions about any future liabilities and maintenance requirements that might transfer back to the local Council when the proposed MDC comes to an end and also that may arise during the course of the areas regeneration.

Mayor's response

Section 211 of the Localism Act gives an MDC power to adopt private streets and spaces and subsequently to manage these as a local planning authority. In addition future services delivered within the Mayoral development area including, but not limited to health, education, affordable housing, community and leisure space, may have future liability requirements. Decisions over future physical and social infrastructure to be delivered within the Mayoral development area would be taken by the MDC Board (including representatives from the local Councils) and these decisions would need to take account of liability and maintenance costs.

- Concerns that developers may consider Wormwood Scrubs provides sufficient open space to support development proposals and that this may result in the failure to provide adequate open space to the north of the Grand Union Canal;
- Insufficient clarity regarding the relationship between the Wormwood Scrubs Charitable Trust and the MDC and the Trust's role in managing the Scrubs;
- Local support for Hammersmith and Fulham Council to continue its role as the Local Planning Authority for Wormwood Scrubs.



# RESPONSE TO OTHER CONSULTATION COMMENTS

## 3 Response to other consultation comments

The main consultation received 309 responses and the supplementary consultation received 247 responses. There is no statutory duty to provide a statement of reasons for not accepting the comments of consultees other than those considered in Section 2 above. However, the following section addresses the main issues raised during the public consultation, in so far as these have not already been addressed in the comments in response to the the London Assembly and the three boroughs. These issues are:

- |      |  |      |  |
|------|--|------|--|
| 3.1  | Business rate relief   | 3.12 | Housing  |
| 3.2  | Consultation process   | 3.13 | Local accountability                                     |
| 3.3  | Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)  | 3.14 | MDC boundary   |
| 3.4  | Commitment to future consultation  | 3.15 | MDC establishment and timescales of operation            |
| 3.5  | CPO powers   | 3.16 | MDC structure and resources                              |
| 3.6  | Detailed planning comments related to – waste                                  | 3.17 | Name   |
| 3.7  | Detailed planning comments related to – density and building heights proposals | 3.18 | Proposed objectives                                      |
| 3.8  | Detailed planning comments related to – local character                        | 3.19 | Principle of the MDC                                     |
| 3.9  | Detailed planning comments related to – amenity health and well-being          | 3.20 | Plan making powers                                       |
| 3.10 | Detailed planning comments related to – transport impacts                      | 3.21 | Planning application powers                              |
| 3.11 | Detailed planning comments related to – local employment                       | 3.22 | Residential compensation and/or Council tax relief       |
|      |  | 3.23 | Representation on the MDC Board                          |
|      |  | 3.24 | Representation on the MDC Planning Committee             |
|      |  | 3.25 | Scheme of delegation                                     |
|      |  | 3.26 | Supplementary consultation on revised boundary proposals |
|      |  | 3.27 | Transitional arrangements                                |

### 3.1 Business rate relief

#### Issue

68 respondents agreed that the Mayor should not take on powers to grant business rate relief, 14 respondents stated that they felt that the Mayor should take on such powers, whilst 128 respondents did not comment on this question.

3 Respondents felt that this issue should be kept under review and 1 respondent felt that business rate relief should only apply to small businesses.

#### Mayoral Response

The Localism Act 2011 allows the Mayor to decide whether to give the Corporation additional powers to give discretionary rate relief for business (non-domestic) rates paid by businesses in the area, except where the ratepayer concerned is a not-for-profit organisation, a charity or a community amateur sports club, in which case the decision as to whether or not to grant discretionary relief will remain with the relevant London borough council.

Where the power to grant discretionary relief is transferred to a Mayoral Development Corporation it would need to meet the costs associated with the decision even though the boroughs will continue to send the business rates to businesses and collect the rates due. Under section 48A of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 the Secretary of State has the power to make regulations concerning the funding of discretionary rate relief and any associated costs in terms of collection and enforcement that arise where the power to provide the relief is transferred to a Mayoral Development Corporation, including transitional arrangements.

The Mayor does not considered it necessary to grant the Corporation powers for discretionary relief from non-domestic rates. In granting these powers there is an expectation that they would be used and this is currently not considered necessary. In the future, if the Corporation thinks it is necessary to have such powers the Mayor would undertake a consultation similar to this exercise.

It is worth noting that not granting these powers to the Corporation would not impact on any future aspiration to potentially set up of an Enterprise Zone for this area.

### 3.2 Consultation process

#### Issue

22 respondents raised concerns about the extent of public consultation carried out, the level of information provided to allow respondents to make informed decisions, the fact that the consultation appeared to be a 'done-deal'.

#### Mayoral response

The level of consultation undertaken exceeded the requirements of the Localism Act. The scale of consultation carried out is set out in paragraph 1.2. The consultation was not a done deal. The Mayor has given detailed consideration to all comments made as part of the consultation and made amendments to the proposals as required, including for instance, alterations MDC boundary, which has undergone a subsequent round of public consultation

### 3.3 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

#### Issue

17 respondents requested greater clarity on the proposed CIL arrangements under any potential MDC.

#### Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.5 for a detailed Mayoral response.

### 3.4 Commitment to future consultation

#### Issue

Angie Bray MP stated that the engagement process conducted by the MDC needs to include local residents, community groups, and businesses and is not conducted solely at a Council level. She went on to suggest that a community engagement strategy be published and widely circulated to inform residents and businesses how they may best participate.

Andy Slaughter MP stated that a number of established residents' organisations in the 3 Boroughs, including the Grand Union Alliance, are meeting regularly to discuss the scheme and that both individually and collectively, these representative bodies should be both a formal a consultee and an active participant in the development.

During the public consultation, 21 respondents raised the need to be consulted on future plans for the area.

#### Mayoral Response

Any future MDC would have a statutory duty to consult on both planning applications and local plans and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

In addition, the Mayor will commit the MDC to preparing a Community Charter in collaboration with the local community. This charter will ensure regular meetings with local groups on key dates to discuss issues relating to a future plan.

### 3.5 CPO powers

#### Issue

28 respondents raised concerns about the ability of the proposed MDC to CPO land. A particular concern was raised in relation to the CPO of residential properties and respondents wanted assurances that the MDC would not look to CPO such properties.

#### Mayoral Response

The Localism Act automatically grants CPO powers to any MDC. The MDC will not possess any CPO powers over and above those already possessed by the local Councils. The use of CPO powers would be subject to safeguards including public inquiry and confirmation by the Secretary of State.

### 3.6 Detailed planning comments – waste planning

#### Issue

7 respondents raised questions about the MDC's future role in waste planning and its ability to achieve future waste planning requirements.

#### Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.26 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.7 Detailed planning comments - density and building heights proposals**

Issue

20 respondents raised concerns regarding the levels of residential density and building heights envisaged for Old Oak and the impact on local infrastructure and open spaces.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.7 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.8 Detailed planning comments - local character**

Issue

4 respondents sought that the existing local character of the area and surrounding neighbourhoods be reflected in forthcoming development.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.8 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.9 Detailed planning comments related to - amenity & health and well-being**

Issue

10 respondents sought that the amenity and health and well-being of residents were protected from potential negative impacts generated by construction activities.

Mayoral Response

The Mayor considers the health and well-being of existing residents of the utmost importance

and a future MDC local plan would include relevant planning policies. The long term regeneration and development of the area would be required to accord with the relevant national, regional and local construction guidance and amenity protection.

**3.10 Detailed planning comments - transport impacts**

Issue

26 respondents raised concerns regarding the potential negative impact of construction vehicles and the creation of additional traffic on the road network. Additionally, concerns were raised about the potential disruption to the public transport network and the need to improve the existing level of public transport.

Mayoral Response

Should the MDC be established, the Mayor would ensure that the MDC and TfL work closely to identify and address impacts on the road and public transport networks and reflect these requirements in the OAPF and Local Plan policy. In addition to policy guidance, each development will be required to provide transport planning information which identifies the impact it will have on these networks and how these would be addressed through planning contributions.

**3.11 Detailed planning comments – local employment**

Issue

Andy Slaughter MP stated that there must be mechanisms to make sure that employment opportunities benefit the local people. Jobs must be advertised locally, and the companies that stand to profit from this development must

be encouraged to employ local residents. This development must be required to employ a percentage of local residents.

15 Respondents specifically requested that employment floorspace, specifically affordable and/or floorspace suitable for SMEs, be safeguarded and delivered through future development proposals.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.10 for a detailed Mayoral response

**3.12 Housing**

Issue

Andy Slaughter MP raised concerns regarding the delivery of affordable housing at Old Oak and Park Royal and the need for development to deliver genuinely affordable housing for local residents. He went on to also raise concerns about the impact that international investors have had on property prices in Hammersmith and Fulham and the need to ensure that this does not happen at Old Oak.

31 respondents raised concerns relating to affordable housing delivery, housing density, housing design and the need to ensure that future housing is protected for local people and not given over to overseas investors.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.12 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.13 Local accountability**

Issue

In addition to the noted in section 2 of this document, 138 respondents raised questions about the future level of local accountability and sought increased levels of local accountability.

Mayor’s response

The proposed MDC Board and committees would be agreed in line with the requirements of the Localism Act. In recognition of concerns and in the interest of involving local people in the future regeneration of the area, amendments are proposed to the composition of the MDC board (see section 2.4) and the MDC planning committee (see section 2.13) to include more local representatives. In addition, it is also proposed to establish a new Community Charter that would commit the MDC to a level of community consultation with local people over the coming years. This Community Charter would be discussed and agreed with local groups.

**3.14 MDC boundary**

Issue

Andy Slaughter (MP) objected to the proposed inclusion of Wormwood Scrubs within the boundary of the MDC.

72 respondents were in support of the proposed boundary and 104 respondents were against the proposed boundary. Of those that were against the proposed boundary, 96 respondents requested Wormwood Scrubs be removed. 4 respondents wanted Hammersmith hospital removed. 4 respondents wanted Horn Lane and adjacent rail sidings included within the boundary. 3 respondents wanted the Hangar Lane gyratory and tube station to be included

within the boundary. 4 respondents stated that they felt that there was insufficient information to make a decision whilst a further 3 respondents stated that they were unsure about the proposed boundary. 2 or less respondents stated that:

- East Acton should be included in the proposed boundary;
- Wormwood Scrubs prison should be removed;
- Northfields Industrial Estate should be removed;
- The Park Royal Industrial Estate should be removed;
- Stonebridge Park station should be removed;
- The derelict land around Alien Way should be included;
- The residential areas around Old Oak Lane should be removed;
- Harlesden Town Centre should be included;
- College Park should be included;
- Wembley High Street, Sudbury Town and Barkham Place should be included;
- Perivale should be included;
- Alperton station should be included;
- Park Royal Cemetery should be removed;
- Unisys building and Bridge Park Leisure Centre should be included; and
- Rail corridor to Westbourne Park station should be included.

Mayoral Response

In addition to the comments out in paragraph 2.13, it is not proposed to remove the Park Royal Industrial Estate, Stonebridge Park station or Park Royal Cemetery (Acton Cemetery) from the proposed MDC boundary. The Park Royal Industrial estate needs to be planned for holistically with Old Oak as it will fulfil a valuable role in terms of relocating businesses. Stonebridge Park station may need improvements as a result of development and

it is therefore sensible that it remains within the boundary so that these improvements can be planned for holistically. Acton Cemetery is a valued heritage asset within Park Royal and it is important that this is included within the MDC boundary in order that consideration can be given to its continued protection.

It is not proposed to remove the residential areas along Old Oak Lane from the boundary as it will be important to plan for development to respect the setting of this Conservation Area. There also may need to be transport improvements made to Old Oak Lane.

It is not proposed to extend the boundary of the MDC to include any sites suggested as part of the consultation. The Mayor recognises that some of the suggested sites have the capability to provide new homes and jobs but the Mayor considers that these sites do not directly relate to the proposals for Old Oak and Park Royal and that planning powers for these sites are best left with the local authorities.

**3.15 MDC establishment and timescales of operation**

Issue

6 respondents stated that the MDC should define the period of time for which it would be in force. A number of respondents also queried the start date of 1st April 2015.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.14 for a detailed Mayoral response.

The Mayor’s intention is that the Corporation would become operational on 1 April 2015. The Mayor considers these timescales to be achievable and it to be advantageous to

establish any potential MDC as expeditiously as possible, in order to progress development plan documents and determine planning applications.

**3.16 MDC structure and resources**

Issue

There were 4 specific queries related to the structure and resources allocated to set up and run the proposed MDC.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.15 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.17 Name of the proposed MDC**

Issue

88 respondents were in support of the name OPDC, 84 respondents did not comment on this question and 13 respondents disliked the name.

24 respondents stated that they did not support the identification of the MDC and it should therefore not have a name. 2 respondents suggested the name Old Oak Development Corporation. The following were suggested by individual respondents:

- OOPRDC;
- London City West;
- PROODC;
- The Western Corridor;
- New Queen’s Park Development Corporation;
- Grand Union Development Corporation;
- Old Oak and Park Royal Local Stewardship Committee;
- Old Oak Sustainable Development Project;
- West London CBD;
- West London Regeneration Scheme;

- West London Triangle Development Corporation;
- Park Royal and Old Oak Regeneration Body; and
- Old Oak Common and Park Royal Development Partnership.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.17 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.18 Proposed MDC objectives**

Issue

81 respondents were in support of the objectives, 95 respondents were opposed to the objectives and 11 respondents were unsure. Of the 95 respondents who were opposed to the proposed objectives all objected to the proposed establishment of an MDC.

62 respondents felt that the protection of Wormwood Scrubs should be listed as an objective. 14 respondents believed that the objectives should be informed by discussions with local residents and the local authorities. 5 respondents felt that the MDC objectives needed to acknowledge the need for the MDC to deliver social infrastructure. 5 respondents also thought the objectives should reflect the need to ensure housing delivery and a further 5 respondents the need to the delivery of affordable housing. 3 or less respondents noted that the objectives should:

- Say more about open space, biodiversity and environmental protection;
- Should say that homes will be for Londoners and not international investors;
- State that there will not be development at Old Oak and Park Royal;

- Should state that the MDC will grant business rate relief;
- Exclude existing residential areas;
- Focus on business and not housing;
- Exclude Park Royal;
- Recognise the need to mitigate development through infrastructure provision;
- State that development should happen incrementally;
- State that development should not be high rise; and
- Look to protect Park Royal.

Mayoral response

Please refer to section 2.21 for a detailed Mayoral response.

### 3.19 Principle of the MDC

Issue

Angie Bray MP was broadly supportive of proposals to establish a MDC at Old Oak and Park Royal, stating that there would be benefits in terms of coordination and strategy that the MDC may be able to bring to a project of this complexity.

Andy Slaughter MP stated that he was unable to support the MDC as currently envisaged and believes it may be the worst of both worlds in terms of the development. Andy Slaughter MP went on to state that there is an argument for appointing an impartial individual to coordinate and arbitrate between the various interested parties, but that the best course in determining both a strategic, democratic and sustainable development for the area is to leave the final decision making in the hands of the Local Authorities.

93 respondents to the 8 questions were in support of the establishment of a MDC at Old Oak and Park Royal, 24 were in broad support but expressed concerns about particular issues, 141 objected to the establishment of a MDC and 13 made no comment on the principle of the establishment of the MDC or were undecided.

108 respondents were concerned that the establishment of a MDC would take powers away from local councillors and local people who are capable of performing planning functions and that this would result in less transparency. 22 respondents were keen to ensure that any MDC ensures that development respects the setting and character of Wormwood Scrubs and that there should be no development on it. 17 respondents were supportive of the MDC but wanted assurances that the local authorities, residents and businesses are involved to ensure local accountability. 7 respondents were supportive of the proposals for a MDC as they considered that this would expedite the delivery of new homes and jobs. 6 respondents were concerned about the implications that a new mayor might have for any MDC. 5 respondents stated that they were disappointed with current local authority led partnership working in the area and that they thought a MDC would overcome this. 5 respondents also considered that the establishment of a MDC would help to regenerate this deprived part of London. 4 respondents believe that there should not be any development in the Old Oak and Park Royal area, 4 respondents also considered that a joint public/private partnership might be a better model for delivery at Old Oak and Park Royal and a further 4 respondents considered that a MDC would help to resolve complex infrastructure delivery issues. 3 or less respondents considered that a MDC would help to resolve cross borough issues, that a MDC would result in the sale of homes to only foreign investors, that the current proposal is limited in

detail and insufficiently researched as presented, that the mayor should be working in partnership with the local authorities and not against them and that a MDC could deliver quality new places.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.1 for a detailed Mayoral response.

### 3.20 Plan making powers

Issue

85 respondents were in agreement that the MDC should have powers to prepare Local Plans and Community Infrastructure Levy. 92 respondents were opposed to the establishment of the MDC and so the role of the MDC in preparing plans for the area.

17 respondents wanted more information and detail on what would be in the Local Plan. 6 respondents felt that there should be a differentiation in planning powers between Old Oak and Park Royal. 5 respondents supported plan making powers but wanted guarantees relating to the involvement of residents. 3 respondents raised concerns in relation to the expenditure of CIL monies and the lack of local accountability. In particular, 2 respondents felt that the local authorities should be able to influence the expenditure of CIL. 2 respondents felt that it was not clear how CIL would be managed. The London Borough of Brent requested greater clarity on the transitional arrangements where a local authority has an adopted charging schedule. A further 2 respondents state that it was unclear how waste planning would be dealt with.

Mayoral Response

The ability of the MDC to prepare a single plan across the whole of the MDC area is central to the ability of the MDC to secure the long term regeneration of the area. In this regard it is proposed the MDC should retain powers to prepare local plans for the MDC area. Local planning policy would be prepared in line with planning policy requirements.

The Mayor does not propose to alter the MDC powers for preparing Local Plans and CIL. The MDC would prepare a local plan and CIL in line with all relevant planning policy requirements and legislation. Planning policy and CIL would be subject to public consultation. The Mayor does not propose to differentiate between plan making powers in Old Oak and Park Royal as it is considered that to properly plan in a holistic manner across the MDC area, it is necessary to apply the same powers to both areas.

As set out in paragraph 9.12 of the consultation report, the intention is that the Corporation would become a local planning authority upon its coming into effect and in accordance with Section 206(2) of the Planning Act 2008 would therefore also become the charging authority for its area.

The Mayor's proposal is that at the time when the MDC Planning Functions Order comes into force then the MDC would become the CIL charging authority and at that point would start the statutory process of adopting its own CIL.

In the interim period before the MDC CIL is adopted the MDC would use section 106 agreements to secure financial contributions from applications. In doing so the MDC would comply with all relevant CIL and section 106 regulations. Existing borough CILs would not apply to new development in the MDC area.

For any applications determined by a local authority prior to MDC Planning Functions Order coming into effect, CIL monies would continue to be paid to that authority, in accordance with Regulations 63A and 64A of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Para 9.5 of the MDC Consultation Report explains that the MDC would take on waste planning powers. As a consequence, the MDC would need to produce its own Waste Development Planning Document.

### 3.21 Planning application powers

Issue

Andy Slaughter MP was concerned that ceding control of major planning applications to the GLA would be seen by local people as a way of imposing unwanted development on the area and that local residents will feel that their views are not being properly represented. Andy Slaughter MP urged that whatever option is chosen for deciding planning consents, the Boroughs must have a majority of votes on the relevant committee or committees.

73 respondents were in support of the MDC having the power to determine planning applications. 107 respondents considered that powers to determine planning applications should remain with the local authorities (of these 92 were opposed to the establishment of the MDC).

42 respondents considered that the MDC should not have any powers over Wormwood Scrubs. 6 respondents believed that local residents need to be more involved in determining planning applications. 5 respondents felt that there should be joint decision making between the MDC and local authorities. 2 respondents wanted the removal of the blanket caveat for

the MDC to determine any planning applications it chooses to. 1 respondent wanted the MDC to determine all planning applications. 1 respondent stated that the proposal was premature. 1 respondent requested that North Acton be removed from the planning application determining area. 1 respondent stated that detailed HS2 applications should be determined by the council.

Mayoral Response

For the MDC to be successful at delivering regeneration at Old Oak and Park Royal, the Mayor considers it imperative that the MDC has the power to determine planning applications. The power to determine planning applications ensures the ability of the MDC to deliver the local plan. It is proposed to delegate planning applications to the local Councils to determine through a scheme of delegation to be agreed between the MDC and the Councils.

In terms of the suggestion that there should be joint decision making between the MDC and local authorities, the Mayor has considered this and is of the opinion that this could lead to potential uncertainty and confusion, possible delay to delivery and this approach is therefore not supported. The planning committee would include representatives from each of the three local authorities to ensure local accountability.

In terms of residents being involved in determining planning application, the MDC would have a statutory duty (Article 13 of the The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010) to consult residents on planning applications and consider any representations in the determination of these applications. As noted in paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 above, transparency and wider community involvement are at the heart of the MDC proposal.

### 3.22 Residential compensation and/or Council Tax relief

Issue

10 respondents suggested that residents should be compensated directly or through Council Tax relief for the potential impact on local services.

Mayoral Response

The establishment of an MDC through the Localism Act 2011 does not afford the MDC the power to grant residential compensation or Council Tax relief.

### 3.23 Representation on the MDC Board

Issue

Andy Slaughter MP stated that Hammersmith and Fulham Council should have more representation on the Board than other interests. The Board must be seen to be accountable to local people, and it is not appropriate for unelected members to have such influence over decisions that will affect so many people; and also that the Board must be seen to be acting on behalf of local people. A majority of Board members should represent either the Boroughs or local residents.

22 Respondents raised concerns about the level of local representation on the board.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.3 for a detailed Mayoral response.

### 3.24 Representation on the MDC planning committee

Issue

10 respondents were in support of Option 1 which consists of a single planning committee for the MDC area. 3 respondents were in support of Option 2 which consists of a single committee but with an extra councillor sitting on the committee for the local authority in which the planning application is situated. 5 respondents were in support of Option 3 which consists of 3 planning sub-committees, one for each local authority area.

91 respondents believed that the planning committee should have representatives from the local community. 23 respondents considered that any planning committee should comprise largely of locally elected representatives. 14 respondents felt that no planning committee was required. 12 respondents stated that planning powers should remain with the local authority. 7 respondents felt that the Friends of Wormwood Scrubs should be represented on any planning committee. 6 respondents considered that there should be representation on the planning committee from local businesses. 4 respondents felt that the environmental sector should be represented within any planning committee structure. 2 or less respondents stated that:

- The Mayor should not have too much power;
- The committee should consist of individuals with talent and expertise;
- The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham should not be represented;
- The development community should be represented;
- The Canal and River Trust should be represented; and
- Committee members should be chose via a live televised auction.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.19 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.25 Scheme of delegation**

Issue

26 respondents requested further clarity on the details of who would determine which planning applications. However, no specific comments on the scheme of delegation were received.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.23 for a detailed Mayoral response.

**3.26 Supplementary consultation on revised boundary proposals**

228 respondents were against the continued inclusion of Wormwood Scrubs within the proposed boundary. Of those that were against the continued inclusion, 205 stated that as the Scrubs is designated as Metropolitan Open Land in the London Plan and is protected by the Wormwood Scrubs Act, the proposed MDC would not have any planning authority over the area. 204 respondents objected to LB Hammersmith and Fulham no longer being the Local Planning Authority and felt that this change would result in the dilution of democratic control. 201 respondents objected to Wormwood Scrubs continuing to be in the boundary while Lindford Christie Stadium and car parking facilities were not. 15 respondents stated concerns that the inclusion of Wormwood Scrubs would negatively impact on its local role as an amenity space. 7 respondents stated concerns that the inclusion of Wormwood Scrubs would negatively impact on its role as a biodiversity asset. 7 respondents stated concerns

that the proposed new development would negatively impact on the existing character of the Scrubs. 2 or less respondents stated that:

- Wormwood Scrubs should continue to be included in the proposed boundary.
- Wormwood Scrubs should continue to be included in the proposed boundary subject to there not being housing on the railway embankment overlooking the Scrubs or a flyover motorway south of the railway line.
- Wormwood Scrubs in its entirety must be protected and access from the north improved.
- The new developments to the north of Wormwood Scrubs would rely on the Scrubs to meet their needs for public open space, therefore resulting in poor provision of new public open space.
- Management of Scrubs has not been fully considered and further information regarding this should be provided.

2 respondents objected to the continued inclusion of the Royale Leisure Park and adjacent areas south of the A406.

1 respondent supported the proposed amendment to remove the A406 North Circular Road, north-east of the West Coast Main Line railway bridges.

1 respondent suggested a number of transport network improvements including:

- A new road named ‘ Old Oak Common Lane North’
- A new hour track bridge over Victoria Road
- A new permanent bridge over the Grand Union Canal from Atlas Road

1 respondent provided commentary on a number of additional elements:

- Requesting that existing residential areas are protected and well integrated into new residential and green space areas
- Protection should be given to residential amenity that exceeds existing best practice
- Waste sites should be relocated

1 respondent objected to the proposed removal of the slip road running adjacent to the A406 from Hanger Lane (travelling north east), in relation to traffic management, and the removal of land to the west of the A406 (in and around Northfield) as proposed as part of the supplementary consultation.

Mayoral response

Please refer to section 2.20 for a detailed response to comments relating to the removal of Wormwood Scrubs from the boundary of the proposed Mayoral development area

The delivery of new public open spaces north of the canal will be a critical element of any future planning framework for the area and will be achieved through development management discussions.

It is proposed to continue to include this area to deliver the coordinated protection and enhancement of Strategic Industrial Land in Park Royal.

With regards the transport suggestions and requests that existing residential areas be protected and integrated into future development, that new amenity be provided, that waste sites be relocated, the Mayor will consider whether they are suitable to be

included in any future planning guidance and policy for Old Oak and Park Royal.

It is proposed to continue to maintain the identified boundary and work with the London Borough of Brent to manage traffic in and around Park Royal.

**3.27 Transitional arrangements**

Issue

During the consultation 12 respondents raised a number of detailed questions in relation to the proposed transitional arrangements.

Mayoral Response

Please refer to section 2.25 for a detailed Mayoral response.

# CONCLUSION

## 4 Conclusion

The Mayor has consulted on plans to designate a Mayoral development area at Old Oak and Park Royal with the aim of establishing a Mayoral development corporation (MDC) in that area, using powers granted by the Localism Act 2011 (“the Act”) and becoming operational on 1 April 2015. The MDC would act as the agency responsible for planning and driving the regeneration of Old Oak and Park Royal.

The responses received during both the main consultation and the supplementary consultation have been considered in detail by the Mayor. Following the outcome of the consultation the Mayor has made amendments to the proposed boundary, the composition of the Board and the role of the local residential and business community in planning for the future of the area. This Statement of Reasons has provided a detailed breakdown of comments received during these consultation exercises and the Mayor's responses.

He continues to propose that the MDC should be the local planning authority for the whole of the area to be designated a Mayoral development area and for the full range of potential planning powers available under the Localism Act 2011.

In conclusion, the Mayor will now lay before the London Assembly his proposals to designate a Mayoral development area, and thereby establish a Mayoral development corporation, at Old Oak and Park Royal.



# APPENDICES

## Appendix: Main consultation leaflet

### Page 1

### Tell us what you think

Further information on the proposed establishment of this new Mayoral Development Corporation can be found by following the link below:

[8 Basildon Road, Old Oak, London W3 9AD, London W3 9AD, London W3 9AD](#)

You can provide your comments via this link or alternatively you can directly email [consult@oldoakmayordc.com](mailto:consult@oldoakmayordc.com) with your comments and/or questions.

When responding please indicate if you would like to be contacted about the preparation of future plans for Old Oak and Park Royal and also provide your preferred contact details.

This consultation will run for 14 weeks from 18 June to 24 September 2014, following which the Mayor will consider all comments received and will consider how best to proceed with setting up a new Mayoral Development Corporation.

Subject to the outcome of this public consultation, as well as further consultation with the London Assembly, and sign off by the Secretary of State, the Mayor intends for the Corporation to start on 1 April 2015.

In responding to this consultation you can comment on any aspect of the proposal. We would also ask that you consider some of the following questions:

- Do you agree that setting up a Mayoral Development Corporation for Old Oak and Park Royal is the most effective way to deliver the Mayor's proposals? If not, what other arrangements could be put in place?
- Would the purpose of the Corporation (see first page) support the transformation of this area? If not, how might it be changed?
- Is the proposed boundary correct, should any areas be included or omitted?
- Do you agree that the Corporation should determine planning applications within the Mayoral Development Area?
- Do you agree that the Corporation should prepare comprehensive local plans for the whole of the Mayoral Development Area of Old Oak and Park Royal?
- The Mayor is not proposing to give the Corporation the power to grant discretionary relief from non-domestic rates. Do you agree with this approach?
- How would you like to be involved in the preparation of the future plans for Old Oak and Park Royal?
- Do you agree with the name 'Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation' (OPDC)?

**MAYOR OF LONDON**

### Public consultation on a new Mayoral Development Corporation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am intending to set up a new Mayoral Development Corporation covering Old Oak and Park Royal and I am running this public consultation to gather your comments on this proposal.

A new Corporation for Old Oak and Park Royal would be the lead on the planning and regeneration of this rapidly developing London location. The purpose of the Corporation would be to:

• Deliver the physical, social, economic and environmental regeneration of Old Oak and Park Royal. To secure maximum benefits from the newly planned transport improvements, to plan for the transformational change at Old Oak and set the overall framework to protect and regenerate the industrial area of Park Royal. A central objective of the Corporation would be to secure high-quality sustainable development and investment for the benefit of the area and the communities that surround it.

The map on the next page shows the intended boundary of this new Corporation.

The Corporation would become the new local planning authority for this area and would take on powers relating to infrastructure, regeneration, land acquisition including Compulsory Purchase Orders, enforcing planning, business and financial assistance.


The Corporation would take over planning powers from the London Boroughs of Brent, Gilling and Harrow and B. Rovers. The Corporation would lead on preparing the local plans and determining large planning applications in this area.

This public consultation will run from 18 June to 24 September 2014. This leaflet provides some short information on the proposal, it explains where you can access more detailed information and how to make comments.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely


**Boris Johnson**  
Mayor of London



aerial view of old oak

### Page 2

### Proposed boundary for the Old Oak and Park Royal Corporation



proposed boundary of new development corporation

**What powers would a Mayoral Development Corporation have?**

The Corporation would be responsible for planning the regeneration of Old Oak and Park Royal comprising powers relating to infrastructure, regeneration, land acquisition including Compulsory Purchase Orders, business and financial assistance, preparing local plans (including Community Infrastructure Levy) and determining large planning applications.

The London Boroughs of Brent, Gilling and Harrow and B. Rovers would continue to perform all other functions, including services related to: services, health, social services, housing, leisure, culture, community, children, crime prevention, safety, education, high streets, business and job support, housing, town centre management, Council Tax, student benefits and green.

**When will the plans for Old Oak and Park Royal be prepared and how can I get involved?**

In the summer of 2013 the Mayor of London consulted on a Vision for Old Oak and over 600 responses were received. These responses are being reviewed and will inform an amended plan.

Subject to the outcome of this consultation, it is intended for the Corporation to start on 1 April 2015. At that point a revised plan would be issued for a further round of consultation, which would take account of the comments received to date. Local people would be given every opportunity to feed in to the final preparation of that plan.

**Turn over and tell us what you think** →

## Proposed revisions to the boundary for the Old Oak and Park Royal MDC

The Mayor of London held a public consultation on the proposed establishment of a new Mayoral Development Corporation for Old Oak and Park Royal, which ran from June 18 to September 24, 2014. The proposed Mayoral Development Corporation would support regeneration across the area including delivery of new transport infrastructure, 24,000 new homes, 55,000 new jobs and the protection of Wormwood Scrubs.

During this public consultation over 300 comments were received. In response two boundary amendments are now proposed that would reduce the development area of the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation.

This public consultation will run from 5 November until 5pm on 25 November 2014.



rail stages at old oak

## Tell us what you think

**Area 1:** land to the west of the A406  
It is proposed to exclude land to the west of the A406, located in the London Boroughs of Brent and Ealing. This land includes the industrial areas of Northfields, Water Road, Abbeydale Road, Queensbury Road, North Circular Road, Brent Crescent and Park Avenue (see Area 1 on the map overlay). This area is considered to be part of Brent Council's emerging regeneration plans for Alporton and the two Councils are keen to bring forward plans for the area that the Mayor considers will result in its social and environmental and economic development. On this basis the Mayor considers it is not expedient to designate Area 1 as part of the Mayoral Development Corporation area.

**Area 2:** land to the south of Wormwood Scrubs  
It is proposed to exclude land to the south of Wormwood Scrubs, located in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. This land includes Wormwood Scrubs Prison, Hammersmith Hospital and the Linford Christie Stadium (see Area 2 on the map overlay). This area is considered to be more closely aligned to Hammersmith and Fulham Council's emerging plans for the White City area. The Mayor considers this will result in the area's social and environmental and economic development. On this basis the Mayor considers it is not expedient to designate Area 2 as part of the Mayoral Development Corporation area.

Should a Mayoral Development Corporation be established the Mayor would continue to work with Brent, Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham Councils to realise the vision for Old Oak and Royal and the surrounding areas, including Areas 1 and 2.

Information on the proposed Mayoral Development Corporation and the proposed revisions to the boundary are available on the Greater London Authority website at <https://www.london.gov.uk/press/press/planning/consultation>. You can provide your comments on the proposed boundary revisions either via email to [oldoak@mayor.london.gov.uk](mailto:oldoak@mayor.london.gov.uk), or in writing to the proposed Old Oak Common Mayoral Development Corporation, Post Point 18, Greater London Authority, City Hall, Queens Walk, London SE1 2AA. Paper copies are available upon request by contacting the address above.

**MAYOR OF LONDON**

## Proposed revisions to the boundary for the Old Oak and Park Royal MDC



- New proposed MDC boundary
- Proposed changes to MDC boundary
- Area 1: Proposed removal of part of A406, Northfields, Water Road, Abbeydale Road, Queensbury Road, North Circular Road, Brent Crescent and Park Avenue
- Area 2: Proposed removal of Linford Christie Stadium, Wormwood Scrubs Prison and Hammersmith Hospital

Turn over and tell us what you think