

# MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL

## MINUTES

### 2 MARCH 2015

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:**

* Sue Anderson	* David Perry
* Stephen Greek	* Kiran Ramchandani
* Susan Hall	* Norman Stevenson (1)

\* Denotes Member present

(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member

#### 21. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

##### Ordinary Member

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane

##### Reserve Member

Councillor Norman Stevenson

#### 22. Declarations of Interest

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

##### Agenda Item 8 – Harrow View (Kodak) Site

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was Portfolio Holder for Community, Culture and Resident Engagement. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

##### Agenda Item 9 – Update on the Regeneration Strategy

Councillors Sue Anderson and Keith Ferry declared a non-pecuniary interest in that they were Ward Councillors for Greenhill Ward. They would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Susan Hall declared non-pecuniary interests in that she had a business in Wealdstone and was on the Board of the London Fire Brigade. She would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he worked for the London Assembly which was part of the GLA. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

**23. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2014, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**24. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions, petitions or deputations were received at this meeting.

**RESOLVED ITEMS**

**25. Townsend and Eaton House Scheme (Northolt Road)**

The Panel received a presentation from Lockglide Property Development Consultancy and Origin Housing Association on the redevelopment of Townsend and Eaton House, Northolt Road, South Harrow as a new build comprehensive residential scheme.

It was noted that, although not within the Heart of Harrow regeneration area, the scheme was a core part of the 2015/18 bid to the GLA. Both buildings were currently vacant.

In response to questions, Members were advised that:

- it was a work in progress. Computer generated design tended to look harsh and the images in the presentation did not fully illustrate the quality of the architecture. Pedestrian traffic was by way of a high raised court, and the scheme would not be higher than building nearby, having 6 storeys by the roadside and a maximum of 9 storeys elsewhere;
- the developer was working closely with a transport consultant and the parking provision was commensurate with the types of property which were one or two bedroom properties, therefore not family and car generating. Full parking surveys in the area would be undertaken. The Panel welcomed that it was not permitted development because for such schemes the Council had no control over elements such as car parking and traffic generation;

- with regard to soft benefits, an active community development team worked with young people and employers were required to use local workforce and arrange apprenticeships. Employment training included gardening for elderly residents. Origin would maintain its involvement in the community;
- if planning consent was obtained by the end of the summer, it was anticipated that work would commence on site early 2016;
- 72 sqm 2 bedroom 4 person flats were spread throughout the development and all had access to the amenity deck. Accommodation for wheelchair users either had two lifts or ground floor location. The Harrow Council Housing Enabling Team which had advised regarding housing need, and the Police Secure by Design Team would be formal consultees;
- a fairly wide boundary for consultation would be undertaken with bespoke consultation with ward councillors and then general public. A Member suggested that ward councillors and others be invited at the end of consultation for updating and feedback.

**RESOLVED:** That the presentation be noted.

## **26. Harrow View (Kodak) Site**

The Panel received a presentation from Land Securities which updated the progress during the previous twelve months. The applicant agreed to circulate the approved plans, committee report and arrange briefings for newly appointed Members of the Panel.

Members were advised that:

- extensive work in relation to the S106 agreement had taken place during the period June to 21 December and on 22 December the developer had advertised for a delivery partner. There had been high interest and the applicants were shortlisted to 5. Reserved matters would be dealt with and the developer was confident to be on site by September. It was anticipated that exchange by April would be followed by the erection of hoardings shortly afterwards;
- provision of affordable housing had been secured, 19% would be affordable,
- updated on new primary school and new school by 2017;
- Site 1B would be decoupled through conditionality in order to enable the acceleration of that part of the development;
- in order to obtain the intensification of development on the site, the developer had secured commitment from the Land Securities Board for a resubmission that provided an uplift in homes across the site;

- the development of site 1A would be accomplished regardless of whether Kodak continued to operate elsewhere on the site;
- the scoping report had been submitted to the team the previous week and the target submission for the new application was May 2015;
- a press release would be circulated subsequent to exchange with the aim of advertising timescales and reassuring local people.

In response to questions it was stated that:

- the percentage of green open space had increased;
- all planning work would be twin tracked with the legal work for an engrossed S106 document. Where there was shared liability the delivery partner would be taking its share of across scheme costs;
- as it was a new application it would be necessary to revisit liability for affordable housing;
- as the planning consent was for a flatted development, balcony amenity and podium gardens would be provided for which there was not yet a fixed design. Undercroft parking, subject to ensuring suitability of frontages, would be provided because basement parking had been discussed but was not economically viable.

The Leader of the Council suggested the development of a partnership between leading Members, Land Securities and the house builder once commissioned. A meeting would take place between the Council and Land Securities in due course.

**RESOLVED:** That the presentation be noted.

## **27. Update on the Regeneration Strategy**

The Divisional Director of Planning presented an update on the Regeneration Programme. It was noted that, following the submission of the Strategy to Cabinet in December 2014, there would be a consultation period running for 6 weeks from March 2015. A Head of Regeneration and Design had been recruited from the GLA and a group of regeneration consultants would be engaged. The officers were congratulated on securing the Housing Fund bid.

In response to questions by Members, the Panel was advised that:

- the aim was to accelerate the provision of homes by bringing forward brownfield sites for development sooner than previously envisaged. The housing zone focus was to identify additional sites;
- the aim was to avoid Harrow becoming a dormitory town and to that effect means of increasing employment opportunities were welcomed;

- infrastructure would need to be re-examined in some cases, and the infrastructure delivery plan required updating. Transport on an individual site basis was being developed based on analysis of site and use. On more significant schemes regular meetings were held with Transport for London aiming to get them involved in an integrated way. For smaller schemes consultation took place with the GLA who in turn consulted with other sectors;
- any amendments to the London Plan would be incorporated;
- a recent feasibility study on the provision of step free access at Harrow on the Hill station had clarified funding but a funding agreement was not yet in place;
- potential health schemes were being discussed and any updated plans required consultation with the CCG. The need to be more proactive with health as a whole was recognised;
- discussions were taking place at officer level as to schools which might require additional forms of entry due to the programme;
- discussions were taking place with the emergency services.

**RESOLVED:** That the presentation be noted.

## **28. Future Topics and Presentations**

**RESOLVED:** That a report be submitted to the next meeting on the masterplan for the Cumberland Hotel site.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.15 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair