

Major Developments Panel AGENDA

DATE: Wednesday 27 July 2011

TIME: 7.30 pm

VENUE: Council Chamber
Harrow Civic Centre

MEMBERSHIP (Quorum 3)

Chairman: Councillor Bill Stephenson

Councillors:

Keith Ferry (VC)
Thaya Idaikkadar
Phillip O'Dell

Tony Ferrari
Susan Hall
Barry Macleod-Cullinane

Reserve Members:

1. Bill Phillips
2. Navin Shah
3. Varsha Parmar
4. Zarina Khalid

1. Joyce Nickolay
2. Anthony Seymour
3. Stephen Greek

Contact: Alison Atherton Senior Professional - Democratic Services
Tel: 020 8424 1266 E-mail: alison.atherton@harrow.gov.uk

AGENDA - PART I

1. ATTENDANCE BY RESERVE MEMBERS

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the whole of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Panel;
- (b) all other Members present.

3. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 10)

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

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive questions (if any) from local residents or organisations under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 51 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

5. PETITIONS

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 49 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

6. DEPUTATIONS

To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

7. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT (Pages 11 - 20)

Report of the Corporate Director of Place Shaping

8. UPDATE ON VARIOUS PROJECTS

9. FUTURE TOPICS AND PRESENTATIONS

AGENDA - PART II

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL

MINUTES

26 MAY 2011

Chairman: * Councillor Bill Stephenson

Councillors: * Tony Ferrari * Thaya Idaikkadar
* Keith Ferry * Barry Macleod-Cullinane
* Susan Hall * Phillip O'Dell

* Denotes Member present

45. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

46. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor Keith Ferry as Vice-Chairman of the Major Developments Panel for the 2011/2012 Municipal Year.

47. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 8 – Strategic Development in the Heart of Harrow

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

48. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

49. Public Questions

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 51 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

50. Petitions

Councillor Phillip O'Dell submitted a petition containing 76 signatures of residents of Carmelite Road, Harrow Weald, objecting to an application for planning permission to convert the house at 113 Carmelite Road into two flats on a number of grounds, including lack of car parking, increased noise pollution, and increased pressure on the drains and sewerage system.

RESOLVED: That the petition be referred to the Planning Department and the Planning Committee for consideration.

51. Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at this meeting under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

RESOLVED ITEMS

52. Strategic Development in the Heart of Harrow

The Panel considered a report of the Corporate Director of Place Shaping which provided an update on progress with the Area Action Plan for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area and set the context for a series of presentations on the implementation of a development and improvement strategy for the area. The Corporate Director introduced Trenton Williams of Alan Baxter Associates, Tony Wood of Harrow Public Transport Users' Association, Stephen Neal of Land Securities and Richard Rees of Business Design Partnership who would be contributing to the presentations.

Strategy

Officers gave a presentation on the overall strategy which reminded Members that stage 1 of the masterplanning study had been completed, and consultation on the Area Action Plan Issues and Options was under way. East Architects had been recommissioned for stage 2 of the masterplanning to develop the Preferred Option. The resulting masterplan would be much more detailed and specific, and would include a narrative on how the space would change, public realm proposals and urban design guidance, such as guidelines on tall buildings, and the strategy for phasing and delivery. It would be developed in consultation with engagement forums representing the community, business and developers, and with Members. It was anticipated that it would be submitted to the September Panel meeting.

Members considered that the public would be very interested in details such as the proposed height of buildings, and expressed concern about the

consultation process for the stage 2 masterplan, specifically that the public would not have the opportunity to comment on it prior to September or be presented with various options on the details. The Divisional Director of Planning explained that the draft seen by the Panel in September would be an early version, and that the final document would not be agreed for consultation until November, at which point there would be a similar level of consultation as was currently under way on the stage 1 masterplan. A Member suggested that the timeline for the development of the stage 2 masterplan and the consultation thereon be placed on the Council's website.

Transport

The Panel then received a presentation on transport issues from Trenton Williams of Alan Baxter Associates, who had been retained as part of the stage 2 masterplanning process in light of the level of concern about transport issues expressed in stage 1.

Mr Williams stated that the Intensification Area had a number of strengths in relation to transport, namely its accessibility, its connectivity to other parts of the borough, and the fact that it was within walking distance to various transport hubs and centres. However, it also presented a number of key challenges, including a high level of car ownership, busy roads which were barriers to pedestrian movement, poor accessibility at Harrow on the Hill Station, selected bus routes already being at capacity during peak hours, and congestion at localised spots. There were opportunities to tackle these issues by means of:

- new development opportunities, which would provide funding for transport improvements;
- structuring new development to encourage sustainable movement;
- improving interchange facilities;
- public realm improvements, such as those implemented in High Street Kensington or Walworth Road;
- smoothing traffic flow, some work on which had already been carried out, for example the potential removal of the pedestrian crossing at College Road and Kimberley Road;
- improving wayfinding and mapping;
- improving cycle facilities – in particular there was potential for a north/south route between Harrow and Wealdstone;
- car clubs and electric vehicles; and
- travel planning – implementing area-wide co-ordination and initiatives.

Alan Baxter Associates were now starting work on a detailed assessment of all these issues with a view to this feeding into the formulation of a robust masterplan.

Tony Wood of the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association was invited to give his views on the presentation. He stated that he did not disagree with the main headlines, but had a number of comments on the details, including:

- the final uses of the development sites would determine the impact on traffic and congestion;
- with regard to increasing capacity on routes between Harrow and Wealdstone, the only alternative to Station Road was Harrow View which was already at capacity, but Station Road could be widened to 4 lanes;
- any bus routes that were currently single-decked should be double-decked; for the H14 route this was an urgent priority;
- accessibility at Harrow on the Hill tube station needed to be addressed;
- Harrow on the Hill bus station was in the right place but too many bus routes terminated there: some of the routes should be joined up and made through-routes. Buses needed to be parked elsewhere; it was not possible to increase the number of stops, so there was a need to reduce dwell time;
- the entry and exit to St Ann's car park should be reversed as they currently required people to use the same piece of road;
- drop off of passengers ('kiss and ride') at Harrow and Wealdstone station was supposed to be on the Harrow side but everyone did it at the Wealdstone side: space needed to be made for this;
- a monorail system should be considered; and
- there was a need to do an origin and destination survey for car journeys in Harrow.

Members also had a number of detailed comments and questions. A Member suggested that there was a need to increase the number of trains stopping at Harrow and Wealdstone Station. Mr Wood stated that the half-hourly London Midland service would be increasing to 3 trains an hour, and that there was also a lot of pressure to make the Southern service half-hourly and to extend it to Gatwick when the franchise came up for renewal in 2015. The Member also expressed strong support for increased travel planning co-ordination and initiatives as this had the potential to make public transport and cycling more attractive: the borough already had cycle routes but they needed more publicity; in addition, there should be a dedicated cycle route along Station Road.

It was noted that the officer report stated that the borough's highway network was capable of accommodating anticipated traffic growth without major investment but Members disputed this, stating that major routes such as Station Road and Harrow View were already at capacity. In addition, congestion would be worsened by additional development in the Intensification Area. A Member suggested that car use should be assisted, as businesses looked at traffic issues when considering whether to move to an area, and this was not addressed in the documents. Mr Williams responded that the statement in the report was a finding of the Transport Audit carried out to support the LDF core strategy. It meant that whilst there would need to be capacity improvements at some junctions, no new major pieces of highway infrastructure, such as a by-pass, were required. A Member felt this was disingenuous, as currently if there were an accident at a major junction the whole area was gridlocked. Mr Williams undertook to take this point on board.

The improvements to Walworth Road were noted, and whether it was a direct comparison for Station Road was queried. The cost of the improvements was also queried, and it was suggested that this was likely to be prohibitive. Members also requested further details of the three towns which had reduced car use through the Sustainable Travel Towns initiative, including their populations. The Divisional Director of Planning undertook to report back on the deliverability of some of the outcomes at future meetings. He also reported that he was in discussion with Transport for London, who were actively reviewing their scheme design standards, and would ask them to attend a future meeting of the Panel.

Office Vacancy

The Divisional Director of Planning gave a brief presentation on vacant office provision. There was a progressive and potentially accelerating vacancy rate, with Lyon House responsible for much of the recent increase. Harrow's attractiveness to business was not what it once was and there were various reasons for this rather than a single driver such as car parking. A concerted strategy was needed to prevent further decline: the borough needed to find a niche and look at how to incentivise businesses to come to Harrow.

A Member suggested that it would have been helpful to have a set of reasons from people such as property consultants as to why the market did not find Harrow attractive. Officers advised that they had had many and varied conversations with consultants, developers and others, and that this information could be provided, but the purpose of the presentation had been to highlight the high-level issues. The Member also queried how much funding was available to support further intervention by the Council to improve the attractiveness of Harrow and Wealdstone, in response to which it was advised that this would depend upon the Area Action Plan and the quantum of development. The Member suggested that it would be helpful to indicate to developers what resources were available to make improvements.

Implementation and Delivery

Members received an officer presentation which proposed the immediate implementation of two schemes to improve the network of public spaces in the town centre, at a cost of £400,000. The first scheme involved de-cluttering and improving the appearance of St Ann's Road, and introducing measures to

improve pedestrian priority in Havelock Place. The second scheme was to improve access and public safety at Lowlands Recreation Ground, which was the largest public space in the Intensification Area. It was anticipated that Council investment in the latter scheme could be used to lever in additional funding through the Mayor's town centre initiative. Members were also shown a map of the year 1 projects which were now under way as part of the Green Grid.

In response to questions, officers provided further details of the proposed works to St Ann's Road and Havelock Place. In addition, it was advised that no consultation had yet been undertaken with residents near Lowlands Recreation Ground but that it would be, and that the former playground in the Recreation Ground had been removed as it had been poorly used and vandalised. A Member also highlighted that St Ann's shopping centre closed at 6pm or 7pm, presenting a barrier to access to Harrow on the Hill station, and that in other shopping centres food halls were open until 10pm or 11pm at night. Officers advised that they had tried over many years to address this but that the shopping centre management were reluctant to undertake investment.

Implementation – Sites: Lyon House

Further to a presentation at the previous meeting on the proposals for the Lyon House site, the Divisional Director of Planning suggested that at this meeting it would be helpful to have a discussion and obtain Members' views on a number of issues, such as the future function of the site, its position in relation to the town centre, the mix and quantum of uses, how it should be accessed from the town centre, and how to ensure its commercial viability. He introduced John Smyth and Martin Sandys of Lockglide Ltd, the project managers for the re-development of the site, Rawdon Sherwood of MOSS Architects and Oliver Boundy of Metropolitan Housing Partnership, who were all in attendance.

Martin Sandys stated that the site was on the periphery of the town centre but still connected to Station Road and the amenities there such as the library, the car park and Debenhams. There were also three majestic old trees at the Station Road end of the site which would be retained. It was therefore proposed to complement development with a major public realm enhancement, to re-integrate the site into Station Road, the value of which could not be underestimated. John Smyth added that Platinum House dominated Lyon Road, so there was a desire to create a street edge that would transform the road.

Members highlighted that the library in St John's Road was only temporary, and felt that the location of the site was problematic. It was noted that there was an alleyway from St Ann's Road to Lyon House and it was suggested that if this could be opened up, it would make the site accessible from the town centre. The developers agreed, but pointed out that the alleyway was outside of their control.

With regard to the use of the site, Members felt that it should not be wholly residential, as that would be a disaster for the vitality of Lyon Road. The inclusion of community use would be welcomed, but only providing there was

a real demand for the facilities. A Member suggested that the site would fit in well with Harrow's night-time economy, given its proximity to The Junction public house and other pubs and restaurants, and that the type of people who lived in Platinum House would welcome bars and restaurants on the site. It was agreed that this might be the best mix for ensuring vitality, as if there was community use only the site would be deserted at night.

Implementation – Sites: Kodak

Stephen Neal of Land Securities and Richard Rees of Building Design Partnership then gave a presentation on the emerging vision for the Kodak site.

The presentation set out the inputs which had influenced the process so far, such as the public exhibitions and design workshops and the themes emerging therefrom, and the draft Heart of Harrow Area Action Plan. These had informed a number of development principles to be achieved, including a long term economic energy and vitality that could spill into areas beyond the site. The economic strategy for the site was the area on which work had focused the most during the past few months, with the result that it was proposed that the site be a focus for Small and Medium Enterprise. The site would be developed over a long time so it could respond to demand and opportunities as they arose. The developers also stated that they would be happy to back a marketing campaign with the Council promoting Harrow as an enterprise hub.

Members were shown maps setting out the emerging masterplan ideas. It was proposed to have a "green link" flowing diagonally from Headstone Manor to Harrow and Wealdstone station, opening up the centre of the site to the public. Pure employment use was focused along the eastern side of the site, abutting the railway line, and acting as a buffer between that and any green space or residential use in the centre. The area fronting Headstone Drive would be mixed use. Ideas about general land use needed to be fleshed out. The proposed phasing for the development of the site was also set out.

A Member suggested that the development incorporate a large function space, as there was a demand for this from Harrow's ethnic communities, and the developers agreed to take this into consideration. Members questioned whether Sport England would acquiesce to any loss of sports pitches, and the developers stated that this would be part of a detailed discussion they would need to have with the Council, but that they were not presenting a scheme which watered down sports provision. Members also queried how much car parking there would be, given the number of new homes on the site, and whether the developers were considering underground car parking. The developers replied that they would be looking for a sustainable solution that struck a balance between the requirements of Transport for London and what the inhabitants of the new homes would want. It was proposed to build mainly family houses on the site rather than flats, and families needed cars. An undercroft car park might be appropriate for larger buildings in the central part of the site, but there would probably be a mix of provision. A Member pointed out that there was good public transport access to Harrow on the Hill from the west of the site via the H14 bus service.

Strategic Sites

The Panel received a schedule of information on strategic sites. A Member was concerned as to whether there had been any progress with Bradstowe House. In response, it was advised that officers had met with the developers the previous week and had discussed the options for re-establishing work on site, namely, the restructure of the s106 agreement or the submission of a new planning application, which in itself would result in a new s106 agreement but which would also result in delays. The developers were considering the options. Officers had made it very clear that the Council was keen to work with them.

Recommendations

The Panel considered the officer recommendations set out in the report. A Member felt that there should be a full consultation on the schemes to improve St Ann's Road/Havelock Place and Lowlands Recreation Ground prior to implementation and suggested an amendment to the second recommendation to this effect; this was agreed.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the report and the actions that were being taken to progress the strategic development of the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area, and Members' comments thereon, be noted;
- (2) a full consultation on the outline proposals and suggested priorities for infrastructure investment in 2011/12 to improve the network of public spaces in Harrow town centre and adjacent to the Intensification Area be supported;
- (3) Members' comments on the issues arising from the presentations on transport and movement within the Intensification Area and the future use of the Lyon House and Kodak sites be noted; and
- (4) the content of the Major Sites Schedule be noted.

Reason for Decision: To ensure that Members were kept informed of progress with the Area Action Plan for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area and the issues arising therefrom, including development proposals for key strategic sites, and that their comments thereon were noted.

53. Extension of the Meeting

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4B of the Constitution), during the discussion of the above item it was

RESOLVED: At 9.50 pm to continue until 10.15 pm.

54. Update on Various Projects

This item had already been dealt with under agenda item 8, Strategic Development in the Heart of Harrow (Appendix 3 to the officer report).

55. Future Topics and Presentations

It was reported that the item on Progress on the Discussions with Dandara in relation to a Specific Proposal, which had been scheduled to be received at this meeting, would be on the agenda for a future meeting of the Panel, possibly in July, as the Dandara proposals were not yet ready to be presented to the Panel.

The item on Work with Open City – a Presentation from Young People, which had also been due to be received at this meeting, would now be received at the September Panel meeting, as the young people were currently busy with exams.

RESOLVED: That the above be noted.

Reason for Decision: To keep Members informed of future items for discussion.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.11 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BILL STEPHENSON
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**REPORT FOR: MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS
PANEL**

Date of Meeting:	27 th July 2011
Subject:	Strategic Development
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Andrew Trehern Corporate Director Place Shaping
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Keith Ferry, Portfolio Holder for Planning Development and Enterprise
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix 1- Schedule of strategic sites

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report updates the Panel on the progress with the Area Action Plan for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area and provides the context for a series of presentations on the outer London Fund and development proposals for Kodak and College Road, Harrow.

Recommendations:

The Panel is recommended to:

1. Note and comment on the actions that are being taken to progress the strategic development of the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area:
2. Note and comment on proposals for round 2 of the Outer London Fund

Bid

3. Note and comment upon the recent consultation on the proposals to improve the network of public spaces in Harrow town centre and adjacent to the Intensification Area; and
4. Comment on any issues arising from the presentations on the development of the Kodak and College Road sites.

Reason: (For recommendation)

To enable the Panel to maintain its over sight role for the preparation and delivery of a development strategy for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area.

Section 2 – Report

Introduction

This report serves to update members of the Panel on progress with regards to both strategic and site specific projects. The report provides an overview of progress on the Area Action Plan (AAP) since the earlier report to the Panel in May and provides for an update on the development of the Kodak site. The report also serves to introduce the emerging proposals for redevelopment of the former Post office site on College Road. With the launch of the Outer London Fund, promising additional funding for projects that contribute towards the vitality and renewal of town centres, the report also serves to inform the panel about Harrow’s round one bid (worth some £870K), and enable further discussion on the second round bid, currently under development.

Strategic Development Context

Consultation on the strategic options for the AAP closed on 26 June 2011. The consultation exercise involved formal letters, press articles together with 14 “road shows” and a competition event at Under One Sky. As a result of this activity, the Council received some 57 representations, making some 295 comments on the document. These are scheduled to be reported to the Local Development Framework Panel (LDF) at their meeting on 19th July 2011.

The following table sets out a summary of responses received to the four strategic development options put forward for consultation:

Option	Support	Not support
Option 1 – One centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Offers most balanced approach to growth which is spread across both centres▪ Makes the most efficient use of both transport hubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Wealdstone and Harrow Town Centre are two distinct communities with different priorities and problems and must be treated separately▪ Would reduce quality of life with too

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposes high levels of balanced residential development - this sector is likely to recover more quickly and more fully than commerce and industry ▪ Most likely to provide the initial momentum and confidence to "kick start" the wider economic recovery of the Borough ▪ Providing buildings are not too high to be detrimental to the view of Harrow-on-the Hill and that the Headstone Manor area is enhanced along with other surrounding green spaces and some of Wealdstone's Victorian characteristics maintained/ matched ▪ Harrow and Wealdstone have always been linked (also because of the railway lines) and a good balance is achieved either side of the Civic Centre, between the two 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ much housing in such a small area. ▪ Rob the distinctiveness of the town centre and Wealdstone, potentially watering down the different offers of both. ▪ Potentially destroy the 'High Street' businesses along Station Rd. ▪ Presents significant challenges in terms of retaining the differential character of the various regions within the intensification area identified in Chapter 3, and the baseline report ▪ Option 1 tries to cram far too much into the area for there to be any hope of providing an attractive sustainable environment. It would be a recipe for traffic congestion pollution and environmental degradation ▪ Represents an approach that is too uniform for such a large area; and would query whether it would be possible, and critically whether it would be the right thing to do, to seek one homogeneous character for the Intensification Area ▪ Is heavily reliant on significant investment in to the Borough, and there is concern this may be overly ambitious
Option 2 – Harrow Plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Directs more vulnerable uses to locate outside flood zones 2 and 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would lead to further deterioration of Wealdstone, which in turn could impact on viability of the Kodak site. ▪ Unrealistic expectations for employment growth and will result in a surplus of under utilised sites and premises ▪ New growth should be directed to both Harrow and Wealdstone centres ▪ Ignores the potential of Wealdstone especially benefit of Wealdstone's transport links as outlined in section 3.21 ▪ The opportunities arising from the significant potential development sites in Wealdstone would not be realized ▪ Harrow Town Centre would become over-burdened to accommodate the projected jobs and homes. ▪ Wealdstone & Station Road would become even more deprived and this is not acceptable ▪ Option is likely to sterilise the land to the north Harrow Town Centre to the detriment of the local economy and local environment
Option 3 – Two Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support but note need to consider that interventions to improve traffic flow on Station Road does not have an adverse impact on businesses ▪ Wealdstone and Harrow Town are two distinct communities with differing priorities as therefore must be treated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would result in "lop-sided" growth which would be to the benefit of Harrow and detriment of Wealdstone ▪ Would result in Wealdstone continuing to be the focus of industrial/commercial development which would result in the Harrow being

	<p>as such</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Believe individual development sympathetic to each location is preferable to the other options ▪ Station Road should not be overdeveloped 	<p>redeveloped at a greater pace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunity for wider redevelopment along this Station Road would be missed
Option 4 – High Roads and Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Achieves more benefits than the other three Options ▪ Would provide the best mechanism for delivering the overarching objectives of the Intensification Area, and achieving the objectives clearly set out in the AAP and indeed within Policy CS2 of the emerging Core Strategy ▪ Delivers the London Plan objectives for the two town centres, as well as stimulating the renewal of Station Road ▪ Station Road must also give the "right impression" coherent with re-development of the 2 centres ▪ Allows both centres to develop their own identity and character whilst regenerating the station road corridor making journeys between the two centres an attractive proposition and experience. ▪ There is no point developing Harrow centre and leaving Wealdstone and Station Road as they are ▪ Gives the highest amount of family housing and the best prospect of improving the environment of Station Rd for pedestrians and cyclists. It will, however, only avoid problems of increased traffic congestion and pollution if new flats in Station Road are planned as a car-free development ▪ Welcome the outcomes for Harrow Town Centre that would be delivered via this option, whilst ensuring a balanced approach throughout the Intensification Area ▪ Would best support delivery at key sites and could potentially generate the greatest outputs ▪ Would achieve the investment and development that would be achieved in Option 3, but with the additional benefit of focusing this principally on the areas with specific need ▪ Most appropriate and sustainable option, ensuring the acknowledged 'opportunity' that the important Station Road corridor offers is not missed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would result in Wealdstone continuing to be the focus of industrial/commercial development which would result in the Harrow being redeveloped at a greater pace ▪ Require significant intervention (e.g through CPOs etc) and investment in Station Road to be achieved, diverting money, time and resources away from the key centres of Harrow Town Centre and Wealdstone ▪ Further expansion of Station Road will lead to a one centre if unchecked. ▪ Station Road has serious congestion issues and strengthening the links between Wealdstone and Harrow along this corridor only will only worsen this

On the basis of the responses received Option 4 received the most support as the option on which to develop the more detailed Area Action Plan proposals. Option 3 was a close second preference for most respondents. Option 1 did receive some support, especially from developers due to the fact that it sought to maximise the potential of all sites. Option 2 received the least support – in fact the only

respondent supporting this option was the Environment Agency due to the fact that it directed development away from areas in Wealdstone subject to flooding risk.

In terms of the raw numbers and the range of consultees Option 1 received support from five respondents, 4 of which were developers and the Hatch End Association; Option 2 only the representation of the Environment Agency in support but numerous comments in opposition; Option 3 received 6 representations in support, with three further consultees ranking this equal with Option 4. Option 4 received the most support with 15 selecting this as their preferred approach and a further 3 supporting both this option and option 3. The LDF Panel have been asked to comment on the development of a detailed masterplan (as part of stage 2) based upon an evolution of option 4, having regard to the comments received supporting option 3.

Given some concerns around the time available for further consultation on the detailed masterplan, officers have also re-visited the programme in order to introduce a further phase of consultation (on this emergent option), in the autumn. The formal, pre-submission consultation will then take place in early spring, alongside consultation on the other two planning policy documents, which are progressing alongside the AAP, through the statutory process.

At the panel, members will receive an update from the consultancy team on progress of the AAP, including details of the vision and key outcomes currently envisaged.

Outer London Fund

On 13th June, the Mayor of London launched the “Outer London Fund.” The fund is a three-year initiative “...dedicated to strengthening the vibrancy and growth of high streets and their environs.” At the centre of the initiative is funding of up to £50 million, supported by the offer of advice that can be targeted at improving the character, quality and economic vitality of selected high street places.

Outer London Fund (OLF) will be allocated in two rounds; the first is geared towards providing an immediate opportunity to access funds and advice for clusters of readily deliverable projects. These should make a visible, if in some cases temporary, contribution to the vibrancy and self-confidence of high street places in the near future. The second round will continue the package of support, adding more places and shifting the balance towards more substantial physical projects that can deliver lasting improvement.

Harrow has engaged with the officers within the Mayors office tasked with supporting the bid process. Two bids, worth some £870K were submitted in time for the round 1 deadline; one for Harrow town centre, and a second bid for North Harrow centre. In parallel with the development of the bids, officers have also been working on bids for round 2 of the fund. Officers responsible for the bid will be providing a presentation and update at the MDP meeting on the Round 1 bid, alongside an over view of the round 2 proposals.

Implementation and Delivery

Kodak site development update

Members of the Panel have received ongoing updates from Land Securities on the development of their proposals for the site. Following recent community workshops and a third round of consultation, Land Securities will be reporting on the development of their emergent master plan and their proposals for the delivery of new job on the site, to fulfil the planning policy requirements arising from the development of designated industrial land.

51 College Road

Panel Members will be aware of the proposals for Dandara Limited for a “tall building” comprising some 410 dwellings and 1,120 sq.m of commercial floor space at the site of the former post office on College Road. Members will be aware that following the Council’s refusal of their second planning application (the first being withdrawn) the planning appeal into the Council’s decision was dismissed on 22 July 2010. In concluding that a tall building (19 stories) was acceptable in principle on the site, the Secretary of State, in line with the appointed Inspector’s view, considered that the proposed development fell short of the policy tests applying to the design of tall buildings – which call for outstanding design quality.

The College Road site has remained derelict since the appeal and re-development of this prominent site continues to be important if Harrow is to reverse its current decline as a place for investment and as an attractive destination for residents and investors.

Officers from Harrow and Dandara have accordingly begun to discuss how, in the context of the appeal decision, the site might be developed in a way that contributes positively to the emergent spatial vision for the area. Dandara have attended the developers’ forums, as part of the AAP exercise and more recently have appointed a new firm of architects, following a design competition. For the Panel meeting, Dandara will therefore set out their emerging ideas for the site and seek comment from panel members on both constraints and opportunities from their development programme.

Strategic site development

An updated schedule showing the status of key strategic development site projects is appended to this report. New to the schedule, having regard to representations received as part of the AAP, is the Colart site in Wealdstone.

Financial Implications

The consultancy costs for Stage 2 of the AAP process are fully contained within the Planning Department’s budget allocation for 2011/12.

The estimated cost of the improvement schemes to St Anns Road and Lowlands Recreation Ground will be met from the Place Shaping allocation in the Capital Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The costs of ongoing engagement by officers on strategic planning applications are met through a combination of Planning performance agreement contributions and income from planning fees.

Risk Management Implications

The risks associated with pursuit of the specific programmes are covered by specific risk registers. The report is not considered to result in any new risks arising to the projects.

Equalities implications

The Area Action Plan for the Harrow and Wealdstone Intensification Area will be subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment. Site-specific development proposals will be assessed having regard to all material considerations. The OLF submission has been subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment.

Corporate Priorities

The masterplanning study for the Heart of Harrow Intensification Area, grant funding from the Outer London Fund and the development of positive proposals for re-development on Kodak and College Road are consistent with the delivery of the following Corporate Priorities

- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe – by developing a public realm strategy and urban design guidelines.
- United and involved communities: A Council that listens and leads –through the Engagement Forums that have been established to shape and test the master plan and the establishment of opportunities for participation in planning applications and the series of events in round 1 of the Outer London Fund Bids.
- Supporting our town centre, our local shopping centres and businesses – through the Area Action Plan that will guide the future development of Harrow town centre and Wealdstone and form one of the key building blocks for an inward investment strategy promoting business opportunities in the borough; through the investment facilitated by the outer London Fund and by long term transformation change in Harrow and Wealdstone facilitated by new development.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 12 July 2011		
Name: Abiodun Kolawole	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 12 July 2011		

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Stephen Kelly, Divisional Director - Planning, Place Shaping
020 8736 6149

Background Papers: None

Strategic sites in "Heart of Harrow"						July 2011
	Location	Proposals	Timescale	Officer	Comment	
1	Kodak	Mixed use development by Land Securities	Planning Application Autumn 2011	Stephen Kelly/Abigail Heard	Masterplan under development following recent consultation.	
2	Civic Centre	Potential redevelopment	TBC	Andrew Trehern		
3	Tesco Station Road	Enlargement and alteration to site, including extension to store, car parking and new frontage	Decision in June/July	Stephen Kelly/Beverley Kuchar	Request for changes to application under review by Tesco	
4	Greenhill Way, Car park	Mixed use development	TBC	Andrew Trehern	Pending AAP outcomes	
5	Former Post office – College Road	Mixed use redevelopment	TBC	Stephen Kelly	New scheme architects appointed. Presentation to MDP in July	
6	Lyon House, Lyon Road	Redevelopment of offices for mixed use commercial/community and residential development	Planning App Summer 2011	Beverley Kuchar/Andrew Ryley	Revisions to proposals leading to public consultation in July/August.	
7	Bradstowe House	Erection of mixed use residential and commercial development	PP granted	Beverley Kuchar/Andrew Ryley	Revised planning proposals under discussion.	
8	Gayton Road Car park	Redevelopment for residential and car park	PP granted	Andrew Trehern	Under review as part of AAP	
9	Former Travis Perkins site, Pinner View	Mixed use re-development for supermarket and residential	PP granted	Stephen Kelly	Development commenced on site.	
10	Harrow Leisure Centre	Redevelopment to provide new Leisure Centre, associate car parking and landscaping	Planning application deferred	Andrew Trehern	Under review in context of Culture and Leisure Strategy development and AAP and PPG17 assessments	
11	Colart Site	Potential re-development	TBC	Stephen Kelly	Submissions made to AAP consultation show residential development. To be examined through AAP process	

Rest of Harrow		Proposals	Timescale	Officer	Comment
Location					
Former Govt Offices, Honeypot Lane	Mixed use re-development for residential, commercial and new business space	On site. Revised application expected in Summer 2011	Stephen Kelly	Revised application expected shortly to re-configure business units and revise housing mix.	
Mill Farm Close	Redevelopment of former Council housing to provide 158 new residential units	PP granted	Beverley Kuchar/ Nicholas Ray	Work commenced on site.	
Rayners Lane Phase F	Redevelopment to provide 55 affordable new homes	PP granted	Beverley Kuchar/ Ian Hyde	Work commenced on site	
Rayners Lane Phase G	Redevelopment to provide new private housing	Pa expected summer 2011	Beverley Kuchar/ Ian Hyde	Final phase of scheme likely to be submitted shortly following recent public consultation event.	
Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital	Redevelopment to provide new hospital and enabling residential development	Outline PP renewed 2010	Beverley Kuchar/Nicolas Ray	OJEU advert published (for devpt partner). Detailed proposals for phase 1 hospital being developed.	
Douglas Close, Stanmore	Redevelopment to provide 79 new residential units	On site. Revised application Summer 2011	Matthew Lawton	Work commenced on site. PA for revisions to scheme to be reported to Ctte on 13 July.	
RAF Bentley Priory	Change of use to provide museum and 103 new residential units	On site.	Beverley Kuchar/ Matthew Lawton	PP issued. Pa and LBC applications for revisions to scheme submitted and under consideration.	
Edgware Town Football Club	Redevelopment to provide 189 new dwellings	Outline pp granted	Beverley Kuchar/ Nicholas Ray	S106 revised to allow for revised AH provision. Works not started.	