

# MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL MINUTES

## 27 JULY 2011

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Bill Stephenson

**Councillors:** \* Tony Ferrari \* Thaya Idaikkadar  
\* Keith Ferry \* Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
\* Susan Hall \* Varsha Parmar (3)

\* Denotes Member present  
(3) Denotes category of Reserve Member

### 56. Attendance by Reserve Members

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Phillip O'Dell

Reserve Member

Councillor Varsha Parmar

### 57. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 7 – Strategic Development

Councillor Susan Hall declared a personal interest in that she had a business in Headstone Drive, Wealdstone. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

### 58. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2011, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## 59. Public Questions, Petitions, Deputations

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rules 51, 49 and 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution) respectively.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 60. Strategic Development

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Place Shaping which provided an update on the progress with the Area Action Plan for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area and provided the context for a series of presentations on the Outer London Fund and development proposals for Kodak and College Road, Harrow. The Corporate Director stated that he was keen to ensure that Members and officers started to tackle materially significant issues whilst at the same time having an awareness that it was getting closer to the time for submission of the planning applications.

The Panel then received a series of presentations. For the first presentation, the Chair welcomed Andrew Wagstaff of Dandara and Peter Jackson of SOM architects to the meeting.

#### 51 College Road

Andrew Wagstaff reminded Members that Dandara's appeal against the Council's refusal of their second planning application for this site had been dismissed on 22 July 2010 but that Secretary of State had concluded that a tall building (19 storeys) was acceptable in principle on the site. The Secretary of State had considered that the proposed development fell short of the policy tests applying to the design of tall buildings which called for outstanding design quality.

Mr Wagstaff stated that his company did not wish to dwell on the past and, following a design competition, had appointed SOM Architects to work with them on the proposed development. The design was at an early stage of the process and the project offered significant opportunities for civic and community facilities and he indicated that he would welcome feedback.

Peter Jackson gave a presentation, which highlighted developments his company had been involved with such as Canary Wharf and Broadgate, and he advised that more recently they had become involved in residential work. Castle Quay in Jersey was the company's first development with Dandara.

In terms of the proposed design of the College Road site, Peter Jackson advised that site was well located with its views of Harrow on the Hill and London and that whichever option was chosen, the station was key part of the town. There were, however, constraints in terms of the railway and Harrow Baptist Church although the latter would welcome a community aspect. He went on to show a draft site plan and stated that it was intended to keep northerly aspect dwellings to a minimum and that there would be retail usage

through a significant part of the ground floor level. The design would give an opportunity to bring civic life into the site and to provide a vibrant retail space. In terms of apartments, living at height would give the benefit and opportunity for great apartment spaces with great views. The project could provide 60% open space and he advised that SOM were considering ways of bringing interest to the landscape and that there was also the opportunity for landscape roof terraces.

Following the presentation, Members asked questions and made a number of comments which were duly responded to as follows:

- responding to a question about parking on the site, Peter Jackson advised that it was not yet clearly defined but was not the principle driver on the design. Andrew Wagstaff added that there was likely to be 360-390 units, lower than the earlier scheme, with 80-90 parking spaces, slightly more than in the previous proposal;
- in terms of affordable homes, Members were advised that Dandara had looked at the priority of the Council and settled on an amount but this could be discussed;
- it was confirmed that energy saving programmes would be included in the design but as the scheme was not yet prepared, it was not possible to compare it to the previous one. It was, however, proposed that the building had greater efficiency;
- a Member questioned whether Dandara had any flexibility in terms of the height of the proposed building if residents raised objections. Mr Wagstaff advised that he would like SOM to do some work on this but that Dandara had spent a great deal of time and effort going through the appeal process. Dandara would respect the Secretary of State's decision but wanted to work with the Council with a view to achieving a development that all parties were happy with and the company would engage with residents on proposals. He emphasised that the site was constrained and did require a certain quantum to ensure viability;
- referring to the Lyon House development, Neptune House and Bradstowe House, a Member questioned the likely pricing of the units and whether the College Road site was economically viable. Mr Wagstaff stated that he had no concerns and that his company was well funded and had never stopped a job half way through. He saw Harrow as an untapped market that would be attractive to people who relied on public access, and in terms of the views from the apartments, that was the challenge for SOM.
- the Corporate Director of Place Shaping sought clarification as to how Dandara would involve residents in the design process and whether there would be a locally based consultation both during the pre-application and design phases. In response, the Panel were advised that Dandara would not present proposals that could not be delivered and that it was intended to have a full and open discussion

and that his door was always open to hear views and comments. There would be a public consultation before the application was submitted. It was expected that the consultation period would run from the end of the year;

- a Member expressed concern at the proposal to have residential accommodation on the ground floor of the development. Mr Wagstaff advised that there had been ground floor residential units in the previous scheme, albeit fronting private open space. He recognised that access arrangements to these particular dwellings required careful consideration;
- a Member queried the potential for cafes fronting the proposed public square and was advised that Dandara would make the ground floor units as active as possible and would continue to engage with the Council on options for this space, including community use.

The Chair thanked Andrew Wagstaff and Peter Jackson for their presentation and responses to questions and comments.

#### Kodak

The Chair welcomed Stephen Neal of Land Securities, Richard Rees of Business Design Partnership and Rowena Collins of PPS to the meeting and advised that they would be making a presentation and reporting on the development of their emergent masterplan and proposals for the delivery of new jobs on the site.

Rowena Collins reported that stage 3 of the public consultation had just been completed and she highlighted the key figures, which would be included in the full report, and outlined the feedback received on the proposals. Overall, 65% of respondents had felt that the Harrow View proposals were moving in the right direction. A negative view had been expressed by 15% of respondents and had mainly concerned housing and the view that no more was required.

Richard Rees outlined the employment location strategy for the site. He also stated that at this stage it was intended to retain the Kodak chimney but that there also needed to be a landmark to the north of the site. During his presentation he went on to outline the issues under consideration such as a need for a road to link to employment on the eastern side, access to the site generally, potential locations for a three form entry primary school and the need for a steer on a strategy for leisure. He explained that many of these issues were linked with the AAP. He described, through space diagrams, proposals for the site.

Stephen Neal advised that it was envisaged that there would be a leisure quarter on the site and whilst this was an idea in progress, it may be sensible to build in a generic use in the planning application. In terms of the next steps on the proposals as a whole, he advised that the findings/ outcome of the consultation would be shared with the Panel at their next meeting.

Having listened to the presentation, Panel Members made a number of comments and asked questions which were duly responded to as follows:

- referring to the proposal to retain the Kodak chimney, a Member questioned whether it should be listed. Stephen Neal advised that a solution needed to be found as the chimney needed to 'earn its place' and it may be that it was developed as a piece of art;
- in response to a Member's comment that there appeared to be encroachment on the green space at Zoom Leisure and what the view of Sport England was on this proposal, Mr Neal advised that the space was currently not readily open to the public. The intention was to open this area into a wider green space and to create more uses for it. It was confirmed that Land Securities were working with Council Sport and Leisure staff in the context of the PPG17 study to ensure that a negative impact on sports provision was not created;
- a Member questioned whether the desire to retain the chimney was a tactic to enable taller buildings on the site and stated that this site was conducive to build higher. Richard Rees advised that, in his view, there was no need to build higher as the majority of the dwellings would be family residential units. There was no intention to build high level apartments, particularly because it was not a city or town centre site, and there would be viability issues as Harrow and Wealdstone was a small station. Market advice had been sought at an early stage which had indicated that it would be difficult to get a tall, flatted block on the Kodak site;
- a Member questioned whether there was a need for a new school and was advised that there had been a clear steer from the local education authority that a three form entry school on the site would be required;
- in response to a question on the amount of parking envisaged on the development given the family dwellings, Richard Rees advised that Transport for London (TfL) took the stance of no cars whilst market pressures dictated houses with parking spaces. Work on this aspect of the proposal was on going and consideration was being given to the development of a car park on the site of a World War 2 bunker. Following up on this, another Member questioned the equalities impact of providing no car parking for family homes and expressed the view that at least two parking spaces were required for 3/4 bed residential units. Stephen Neal advised that whilst Land Securities could design such properties, there was an issue in terms of meeting TfL requirements and obtaining their approval;
- Richard Rees confirmed that there were 2 or 3 hotspots of contaminated land on the site but the area that Land Securities had acquired had already been cleared. There was more of an issue with existing basements. Stephen Neal added that Kodak was a world wide company and cleaned sites to the United States rigorous standards;
- a Member questioned the relationship between Land Securities and Kodak and was advised that the two organisations were tied together

for the development of the landholding and that legally Land Securities were the only company able to purchase surplus land from Kodak;

- the Corporate Director questioned whether the proposed 1,500 jobs proposed for the site were additional jobs and was advised that these were included in the overall masterplan and would contribute to the 3,000 new jobs target set out in the AAP.

The Chair thanked the representatives for their attendance and responses.

### Area Action Plan

An officer made a brief presentation on the emerging spatial vision for the intensification area and set out the responses to the first round of consultation. He outlined the key issues and advised that the majority of support was for option 4, High Roads and Centres. He introduced Angela Spencer of East, Trenton Williams of Alan Baxter Associates and Chris Hall of GVA Grimley, who would be making a presentation on the emerging spatial vision.

Angela Spencer gave a detailed presentation, advising that a coherent strategy for the whole borough was being developed. She outlined the key drivers and benefits of intensification and expressed the belief that all development should be linked to green space. She stated that only one tall building (19 storeys) should be built in the intensification area and that was on the Dandara site. Buildings of 6-8 storeys could be built on the College Road site, 2-3 storeys on the car park site, 5-8 storeys with perhaps one taller building on the Lyon Road site with 2-3 storey family housing on the Gayton Road site. She advised that East was working with TfL on impacts of increased residential development on the Kodak site.

Following the presentation, the officer advised that it would be helpful if the Panel could consider the emerging spatial vision and offer their views. The Corporate Director added that the intention had been to set out the progress so far and to seek advice on how to take forward the engagement with Members. Members then questioned officers and the consultants, made comments which were then responded to as follows:

- following on from the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20 July 2011, a Member reiterated a question that he had asked at that meeting in relation to the timescale for the development of the Civic Centre as it appeared that there would be no change for at least 10 years. The Corporate Director advised that there was a long term plan which sat alongside the Core Strategy which took the Council to 2026. It was a commercial master plan and would take account of all commercial options. The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise added that there was a need to focus on the whole AAP;
- a Member questioned the likely height of the development on the College Road site and was advised that there would be consultation on

height and density. The Portfolio Holder added that Members needed to look forward and to guide East on what they should concentrate their work on, particularly with the impending holiday period. Another Member commented that residents did not want tall buildings in the town centre and that such a structure would be more appropriate on the Kodak site. She expressed her disappointment that more use was not proposed for land in the middle of the borough;

- a Member commented that the Council should focus on an uplift to the business footprint given the situation with business rates. The Portfolio Holder advised that the Department of Communities and Local Government intention to permit a change from class B1 to C3 without the need for planning permission would give an uplift value of approximately 40%. In terms of the jobs target for the intensification area, Mr Hall stated that this could be considered at the next meeting;
- a Member stated that the Administration needed to take a view as to the way forward adding that a steer on the future of the Civic Centre was required. She added that the cost to the public realm on some of the proposals would be extremely high. Another Member commented that it would be helpful to concentrate on a smaller number of issues.

Following the comments received, the Corporate Director stated that as considerable detail had been given during the presentation he would ask his officers to engage with Members during August to seek their views. He would also arrange for copies of the presentation to be circulated in a suitable format. He also flagged up that due to room availability it might be necessary to identify an alternative date for the next meeting.

The Chair thanked the representatives for their attendance and responses.

#### Outer London Fund

The Chair welcomed Michael Owens to the meeting. Mr Owens gave a presentation on the submission to date and advised that the round 2 submission deadline was 14 October 2011. The bid was currently being prepared and a further report would be given in September. In terms of the round 1 bid, Mr Owens advised that the outcome was expected on 29 July 2011.

Members welcomed the presentation and report and expressed their thanks to Mr Owens and hoped that the bid would be supported.

#### Town Centre Infrastructure

An officer gave a brief presentation on the schemes for St Anns Road and Lowlands Recreation Ground. He advised that, in relation to the first of these, he would be meeting the St Anns Centre Manager and occupants of other frontages affected by the scheme.

In response to the presentation, a Member stated in the strongest terms that the Panel had not approved £400,000 expenditure for the two schemes and

had not been aware that this was what had been requested at the previous meeting. She stated that the Panel had no such powers. In response, the officer apologised for the phrasing and acknowledged that the Panel had supported rather than approved the proposal for the expenditure.

Referring to the Lowlands Recreation Ground scheme, a Member expressed concern that the proposed new entrance to the park, close to the rear of Harrow on the Hill station, would create a dangerous conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. The officer stated that the issue was recognised and that there was no intention to provide a direct access route to the town centre. The officer added that he would be meeting with TfL the following day and would be discussing this issue. Another Member questioned whether, if the first round bid for OLF was successful, that funding could be used for these schemes. The officer responded that there was likely to be provision in the round 2 bid.

### Strategic Sites Update

The Panel received the update schedule and a Member questioned the current position in relation to Bradstowe House and sought an assurance that the site was secure. The officer advised that the Council was awaiting options from the developer.

#### **RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the actions being taken to progress the strategic development of the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area be noted;
- (2) the proposals for round 2 of the Outer London Fund Bid be noted;
- (3) the recent consultation on the proposals to improve the network of public spaces in Harrow town centre and adjacent to the Intensification Area be noted.

**Reason (for recommendation):** To enable the Panel to maintain its oversight role for the preparation and delivery of a development strategy for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area.

#### **61. Update on Various Projects**

This item had been dealt with under the agenda item on Strategic Development.

#### **62. Future Topics and Presentations**

Following the earlier discussion on Strategic Development, Members considered which items they would like to receive at their next meeting.

Members agreed that the priority for discussion was the AAP.

#### **63. Termination of Meeting**



In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48.2 (Part 4D of the Constitution) it was

**RESOLVED:** At

(1) 9.53 pm to continue until 10.15 pm;

(2) 10.14 pm to continue until 10.20 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.32 pm, closed at 10.18 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BILL STEPHENSON  
Chairman