

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL MINUTES

10 JULY 2019

Chair: * Councillor Keith Ferry

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Paul Osborn
* Simon Brown (2) * Varsha Parmar
* Stephen Greek * David Perry

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member

23. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Ghazanfar Ali

Councillor Simon Brown

24. Appointment of Vice-Chair

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor Paul Osborn as Vice-Chair of the Major Developments Panel for the 2019/2020 Municipal Year.

25. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 9 – Stanmore, Canons Park and Rayners Lane Station Car Parks

During the course of the meeting, Councillor Stephen Greek declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was employed by the London Assembly. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

26. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2019 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

27. Public Questions

To note that one public question had been received and responded to and the recording had been placed on the website.

28. Petitions

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were received.

29. Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received.

RESOLVED ITEMS

30. Harrow View East

The Panel received a presentation from Barratt Homes, Carter Jonas and PTE Architects on the Harrow View East Development.

Following the presentation, the presenters responded to the Panel's questions and comments as follows:-

- the self storage units were located at the edge of the site as it was strategic industrial land and had been designated as such in the outline plan;
- it was a requirement of the London Plan that electric charging points be provided. From the outset, it was expected that 70-80 would be provided but there would subsequently be the opportunity to increase this number;
- the Kodak chimney was 3 storeys higher than the proposed 18 storey building;
- testing of the amount of light and wind in and around the avenues of the proposed development and between the higher buildings had been carried out and the design amended accordingly;
- the spaces had been designed to be flexible;
- in terms of the impact on Wealdstone town centre, residents would spend in local shops and on local services which would result in a positive impact on regeneration. Further details could be provided to Members;

- the Section 106 agreement required that a percentage of suppliers and workers from the local area be used in terms of construction and that further details would be provided following the meeting;
- the concerns in relation to the Goodwill to All junction were recognised but there were constraints due to the size/ space at the junction. Feedback from surveys undertaken had indicated a lack of pedestrian facilities at the junction. Consideration had been given to banning the right turn as it had a disproportionate effect.

Members requested that the following comments be noted:-

- whilst some aspects of the development were attractive, the proposed 18 storey building was not;
- some aspects of the proposed development were like a 'concrete jungle' and it was felt that some buildings were too high;
- the large entrance halls to the properties and sense of place were to be welcomed;
- the number of car parking spaces was unrealistic;
- there was concern whether the number of cafés could be sustained in the development. It was important to have activity in the evenings for reasons of safety;
- Members expressed concern at the safety of the Goodwill to All junction and requested sight of the results of the consultation;
- it was pleasing to see the inclusion of 60 extra care beds in the proposed development.

In response to a Member's question, the Interim Chief Planning Officer confirmed that there would be a single planning application.

The Chair thanked the presenters for their attendance, presentation and responses.

RESOLVED: That the presentation be noted.

31. Stanmore, Canons Park and Rayners Lane Car Parks

The Panel received a presentation from Catalyst and Transport for London (TfL) in relation to proposed developments on Stanmore, Canons Park and Rayners Lane Station car parks.

Following the presentation, the presenters responded to the Panel's questions and comments as follows:

- TfL had requested that Catalyst include step free access to the station in the design for Stanmore station car park;
- 10% of the residential properties would have a blue badge parking space;
- electric car charging points would be included in the NCP car parks as part of the rollout when the station car parks reverted to TfL;
- TfL aimed to provide compliant developments and would be concerned if were not possible to have 100% car free development located on a station car park;
- the mix of size of properties was being discussed with the Council's Housing team and there would be further work as the designs were developed. The scheme was 100% affordable homes and consideration would given as to what best met the need of prospective residents;
- there would be a number of surveys undertaken to look at usage of the station car parks;
- as the developments were car free there would not be an increase in traffic although a modal shift and adequate infrastructure was required. Issues such as safe walking routes and reliable bus routes would be considered in the transport assessment;
- Wembley Stadium had an event management plan but surveys to assess the impact of event days at the sites would be undertaken;
- there would be servicing areas within the developments for those residents who required visits by carers.

Members requested that the following comments be noted:-

- car free developments were to be welcomed for those who wished to travel into London but it did make it difficult to travel to other locations;
- there was a need for more family housing;
- whilst it was pleasing to see that some parking for commuters would be retained at each site, Members expressed concern at the expectation that more people would change their mode of transport. This was felt to be unrealistic and may result in pushing cars to park elsewhere thereby resulting in more pollution and congestion. It was important to understand why commuters felt it necessary to drive and park at the stations;
- consideration needed to be given as to how residents could be prevented from parking in the station car parks. Residents may live on a car free development but still own a car and park it elsewhere;

- concern was expressed that car free developments may cause the areas to become 'dormitory' with residents unable to travel easily around the borough, particularly as some bus routes had been reduced/cut;
- TfL could use these car free developments as a 'beacon' scheme across London;
- the next presentation should address the concerns raised, including the increase in congestion.

The Chair thanked the presenters for their attendance, presentation and responses.

RESOLVED: That the presentation be noted.

32. Update on Various Projects

No updates were received.

33. Future Topics and Presentations

A Member suggested that cross borough transport be discussed at a future meeting as the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel were not aware of the all development sites in Harrow.

RESOLVED: That Members advise the Interim Chief Planning Officer of any suggestions for future topics and presentations.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY
Chair