

PLANNING COMMITTEE (SPECIAL) MINUTES

26 JUNE 2012

Chairman: * Councillor Keith Ferry

Councillors:

* Mrinal Choudhury	* Joyce Nickolay
* Graham Henson (1)	* Simon Williams (1)
* Jerry Miles (4)	* Stephen Wright

In attendance: James Bond)
(Councillors) Susan Hall) Minute 286
 Anthony Seymour)
 Sasi Suresh)

* Denotes Member present
 (1) and (4) Denote category of Reserve Members

281. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor William Stoodley
 Councillor Bill Phillips
 Councillor Stephen Greek

Reserve Member

Councillor Graham Henson
 Councillor Jerry Miles
 Councillor Simon Williams

282. Right of Members to Speak

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, Councillor Anthony Seymour, who was not a Member of the Committee, was

allowed to speak on Kodak Site, Headstone Drive & Harrow View (P/3405/11).

283. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 7 - Kodak Site, Headstone Drive & Harrow View (P/3405/11)

Councillor Anthony Seymour declared a personal interest as a solicitor who had worked on transactions with Land Securities, although not with regard to the planning application site. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Susan Hall declared a personal interest as a business owner within the vicinity of the planning application site. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

284. Petitions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions or deputations were received.

285. Representations on Planning Applications

RESOLVED: That in accordance with the provisions of Rule 18 and following agreement to suspend Rule 30.4, representations be received in respect of agenda item 7 (Kodak Site, Headstone Drive & Harrow View (P/3405/11)).

RESOLVED ITEMS

286. Planning Applications Received

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the Addendum was admitted late to the agenda as it contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the despatch of the agenda. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the item before them for decision.

KODAK SITE (COMPRISING KODAK FACTORY & FORMER SPORTS GROUND (ZOOM LEISURE)), HEADSTONE DRIVE AND HARROW VIEW (P/3405/11)

P/3405/11: - (L S Harrow Properties Ltd). Outline planning application for a comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of land at Harrow View and Headstone Drive, as set out in the Development Specification (March 2012). The development comprises the demolition of existing buildings and structures (with the exception of the chimney and part of powerhouse) and redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses comprising business and employment uses (within Use Classes B1(a), B1(b), B1(c), B2 and B8 – up to 35,975sqm); residential dwellings (within Use Class C3 – up to 985 units);

student accommodation (Sui Generis use – up to 220 units); senior living accommodation (within Use Class C2); assisted living care home (within Use Class C2) (total C2 uses up to 9,300sqm); retail and restaurant uses (within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 – up to 5,000sqm); commercial leisure uses (Use Class D2); community uses (Use Class D1); health centre (Use Class D1); a primary school (Use Class D1) (total D1/D2 uses up to 8,830sqm); energy centre (Sui Generis use – up to 4,500sqm); together with new streets and other means of access and circulation; highway improvements; associated parking; re-profiling of site levels; utilities diversions and connections; open space; landscaping and ancillary development including infrastructure, works and facilities.

It was reported that a site meeting had taken place. In introducing the report, an officer outlined the basis for the recommendation of officers advising that the site was a comprehensive development of employment and community uses, enabled by new residential development. The Committee was being asked to consider the approval of the outline planning application in accordance with a number of parameter plans. He noted that the Council had sent out 16,000 letters and that the applicant had held a variety of community engagement and consultation events to seek views on the application proposals. 50 responses had been received to the planning application consultation with the views and concerns expressed summarised within the planning report. A late letter from Gareth Thomas MP had also been received and was reported on the Addendum sheet.

He also made the following points:

- with regard to the transport impacts officers were working hard to achieve an optimised solution, balancing the interests of all (motorists and pedestrians/cyclists);
- building heights had been informed by the character of the area, existing buildings on the site, a market appraisal and consultation with the community, resulting in an application which provided low to mid rise buildings.
- it was estimated that re-development of the site would take place over a 10-12 years timeline;
- to satisfy the policy of the Council that no green space would be lost as part of development, the planning proposal provided new and interim spaces that equated to an overall increase in open space (mainly through the identification of the green corridor) and no net loss of open space within each phase.

In response to questions from Members it was noted that:

- the developers would be required to submit a strategy regarding landscaping to ensure a coherent approach to the landscaping across the site and to help address issues such as specific uses, long term management, healthy living, public safety etc;

- with regard to architectural excellence of the site a design parameters document had been submitted to ensure a consistent approach to reserved matter applications. All reserved matters would be considered by officers in relation to the parameters and such issues would be for consideration by the Council in line with the expectations of the Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework;
- the Mayor's London Plan promoted the provision of student accommodation as it was recognised that within London there was a current under provision of such living accommodation;
- the management and maintenance of the chimney retained would fall to the responsibility of the developers for all matters;
- the inclusion of the chimney in the development proposals arise from representations received for its retention during the pre-application community engagement and officers felt it would also serve as a strong focal point within the green space provision;
- officers were disappointed at the comments of Sport England, given the engagement with leisure Services and Planning officers around the ongoing development of the Council's Sports Pitches Strategy;
- with regard to the affordable housing element officers were working towards a mechanism in the S106 to optimise the type and quantum of housing beyond the 20% baseline through the use of grants where possible;
- the Council had a legal obligation to provide secondary school places and would seek to use S106 contributions towards the improvement of off site provision;
- the Area Action Plan identified a target to create 3,000 jobs and it was anticipated the planning application proposal could contribute a significant proportion (potentially almost 2,000 jobs) to this target;
- the treatment of the linkage to Wealdstone and particularly the improvement of the bridge under the railway raised challenges and officers were working collaboratively with transport to ensure an appropriate solution;
- officers had not considered a tunnel to link the site with Tudor Road because of the significant engineering challenges;
- the uses within the retained and refurbished power house (under the chimney) included use as a community café element which was considered to be sustainable due to the anticipated rise in employment, residential and student populations on the site, alternative uses could include a wider range of community use such as a crèche if the proposed use proved unsustainable;

- it was recognised that there was a common thread of concern with regard to traffic congestion and local traffic junction capacity issues. However, officers were confident sufficient funding was in place to address these impacts in a programmed manner, contingent on all permissions being achieved.

The Committee received representations from one objector, Jane Galbraith; one supporter, David Summers; and a representative of the applicant, Stephen Neal.

RESOLVED: To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- (1) the Conditions set out at the end of the report and tabled addendum (together with any additional conditions deemed necessary following referral to the GLA and Secretary of State);
- (2) referral to the GLA under Stage 2 of The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008;
- (3) referral to the Secretary of State (DCLG) under The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009;
- (4) the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement, by 21 December 2012, in general accordance with the Heads of Terms set out in the addendum and to include consideration of phasing of such payments (subject to further negotiation and agreement);
- (5) authority to be delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the sealing of the Section 106 agreement and to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement. In the event that any amendments are not considered to be minor, or are not agreed, the application will be reported back to Planning Committee for further consideration.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.32 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY
Chairman