

# MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL MINUTES

## 4 NOVEMBER 2015

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Sue Anderson \* Barry Macleod-Cullinane  
\* Stephen Greek \* David Perry  
\* Susan Hall \* Kiran Ramchandani

**In attendance:** Glen Hearnden Minute 45  
**(Councillors)**

\* Denotes Member present

### 40. Attendance by Reserve Members

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance.

### 41. Declarations of Interest

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

#### Agenda Item 7 – Grange Farm Estate

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a non-pecuniary interest in that the Grange Farm Estate was in his Ward and, as a former Portfolio Holder, he had helped to establish it on the work programme. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

#### Agenda Item 8 – Gayton Road

Councillor Sue Anderson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that Gayton Road was in her Ward. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

The Chair informed the meeting that there were Members of the Panel representing Harrow on the Hill, Greenhill and Marlborough, all of which had sites that were the subject of presentations at the meeting.

#### **42. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2015, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

#### **43. Public Questions**

To note that one public question had been received and responded to and in line with the statement made by the Chair, the recording had been placed on the website.

#### **44. Petitions and Deputations**

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

### **RESOLVED ITEMS**

#### **45. Grange Farm Estate**

The Panel received a presentation from Hawkins Brown Architects, DPP One Planning Consultants and PBA Engineering in conjunction with Housing Department representatives on proposals for a comprehensive development incorporating traditional flats and houses.

Members were advised that the majority of the land was owned by the Council and the scheme would consist of the re-provision of the social housing, 50% to buy and a community centre. It was planned to use existing entrances and create through routes for connectivity and portray an urban context adjacent to Northolt Road and a suburban context to the north with taller buildings to the south and using the roofline to give character and break scale down. There would be a new pedestrian entrance onto Northolt Road, provision of a community centre at the confluence of routes at the centre of the development, a new pedestrian route to the retail park and village green.

Members were advised that, the housing department was with residents listening to comments and ideas, while the architects undertook intensive consultation. It was noted that a competitive design process had been undertaken which had provided some strong ideas to take forward. It was acknowledged that parking was an issue and that it was important to get the correct balance and blend of design, green space, play and parking.

In response to questions from Members, it was stated that:

- in order to combat anti social behaviour (ASB) overlooking would be encouraged as part of the secure by design initiative but was at an early stage;

- with regard to car parking there would be 548 homes and 262 car parking spaces which was in excess of current planning requirements and was in accordance with planning policy where good accessibility to public transport could encourage sustainability. 50 spaces would be in the covered podium;
- the developer was aware of parking sensitivity and had recently appointed a transport consultant who would be made aware of the concerns raised by Members. It was recognised that congestion in the area needed to be managed. It was suggested that an approach be made to Waitrose with a view to car parking outside operating hours. There would be two phases of development, the scope of which was dependent on factors including a central heat and power location. Negotiations to purchase one block of Genesis flats was well underway and discussions were taking place with other leaseholders on site;
- a project meeting was due to be held the following day. The aim was for a planning submission February/March 2016 with a start on site at the end of 2016. It was anticipated that each phase should take about 18 months;
- all ground floor dwellings would have garden space, and the remainder a balcony. There would also be communal garden space;
- the scheme was working to the LGA minimum on floorspace and it was hoped to increase this if possible. Internal arrangements would be reviewed with the occupiers.

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

#### **46. Gayton Road**

The Panel received a presentation from Fairview Homes on the development which encompassed two areas belonging to Harrow Council and one to Fairview Homes. Members were informed that at its meeting on 17 September 2015, Cabinet agreed to enter into contracts for the development of Gayton Road surface level car park and the site of the ex-Gayton Road Library to include the property situated between them known as Sonia Court.

The target provision was 350 homes which equated to approximately 200 more homes than if the areas were to be developed separately. It was a residential led scheme with engagement having taken place with the Portfolio Holder and Greenhill Ward Councillors and with well attended public exhibitions.

Members were advised of the provision of a basement car park under three of the blocks. 172 spaces including some at ground level would be provided which equated to .45 parking per dwelling. There would be the same access for all tenures with private external amenity space.

In response to questions from Members, it was stated that:

- there would be 355 units comprised of: 1 bed x 98, 2 bed x170, 3 bed x 87 (suitable for five persons);
- the representatives did not have the feedback from the public exhibition with them. A statement of community involvement was being produced and would be available with the application;
- with regard to play space for children, the courtyards were amenity space for the blocks they belonged to. There would also be public amenity space;
- a landscape architect had recently been appointed. Some trees would be retained, some planted, some lost. the intention was to enhance the look of Gayton Road and shield some of the buildings with greenery;
- the intention was to sell two blocks to Harrow Council. Pepperpotting the sites had been considered but organisations such as housing associations did not support this approach. It would not be possible to tell the difference between the tenures from the inside;
- the social housing would have surface car parking as underground parking would be more expensive;
- some hard landscaping would be permeable. Calculations had been done with regard to drainage and comparison of soft and hard landscape compared with the present site use;
- the maximum separation from boundary to minimise impact would be implemented, with over 20 metres between the boundary and face of the building. Some trees would be retained, some planted, some lost;
- traffic surveys and modelling indicated that traffic movements would be slightly less than current. A full traffic assessment would be undertaken. The single entrance would help simply the flow.

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

#### **47. Palmerston Road**

The Panel received a presentation from Origin Housing on the development of two sites, Palmerston Road and Deller, on a single site united by space under the flyover. The development aimed to open the site up to pedestrians and provide significant housing and work opportunities with 200 jobs and 180 homes of which 50% would be affordable. The site coverage was 40.5% with all flats having dual aspect.

In response to questions from Members, it was stated that:

- it was envisaged that the area under the flyover would be open to the public during the day only. The area would be managed by Origin housing with the aim of transforming it and controlling access;
- the hub would provide the predominant employment and have a small café for the residential population/hub. Shops were not planned for the area as blank shopfronts were not wanted;
- car parking for residents in an underground car park had been agreed by highways and visitor parking would be available at the hub;
- air quality and acoustic testing and wind modelling would provide information. At about two storeys higher than ground level, cars were not to the detriment of the area under the flyover. The blocks would be arranged in order to give more air control.

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

#### **48. Harrow School Sports and Science Block**

The Panel received a presentation from the Director of Estates at Harrow School on proposals for the development of a sports and science block. The Panel was informed that the proposals reflected the existing need and that there was no intention to increase the school roll.

The buildings were interlinked so lent themselves to a comprehensive single planning application. The structural failure of the sports centre and limited storage and medical facilities required replacement. The scheme had been presented to the design review panel and its feedback was under consideration.

In response to questions from Members, it was stated that:

- proposals to increase community use were under consideration such as mother and child use of the pool;
- its location at the base of the hill meant that there would be no overlooking. The development would be contained within the context of the school estate. The proposed location of the science block was on the fringe of the Harrow School Conservation Area and discussions were taking place with Historic England;
- the developer was in conversation with the Council regarding community engagement which was due to commence in November 2015;
- the proposals would not compromise any public rights of way which would be maintained during the construction period;

- whilst not significant, the proposals would include an income stream for training and conferences or for teas for spectators as three classrooms and a finishing kitchen would be created;
- it was currently a constraint not to have a classroom for teaching PE, particularly at A level;
- the new admissions building featured in the Harrow School Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was not part of the application. The packaging of the various developments would prevent it being a large building site for three years.

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

#### **49. Regeneration Update**

The Divisional Director Regeneration and Planning gave a presentation on the status of major development projects in Harrow which provided summary data on each scheme.

The Panel was informed that the formal housing zone had been agreed and negotiation was taking place with the GLA on more specific funding for the Harrow Council schemes. A presentation would be made to the Conservative Group the following week including the proposals for the replacement Civic Centre.

In response to a request from a Member, the Divisional Director undertook to provide Members with a copy of the strategic study recently completed on the town centre car parks.

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

#### **50. Future Topics and Presentations**

A Member asked whether, due to the strategic nature of the Panel, the Chief Executive should be in attendance at meetings of the Panel. The Chair stated that he would be advised of the meetings.

**RESOLVED:** That any ideas from Members for topics for the next meeting of the Panel on Monday 29 February 2016 be submitted to the Divisional Director Regeneration and Planning.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.50 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair