

Planning Policy Advisory Panel

Minutes

18 September 2023

Present:

Chair: Councillor Marilyn Ashton

Councillors: Christopher Baxter David Perry
 Stephen Greek Zak Wagman
 Nitin Parekh

**In attendance
(Virtual):** Asif Hussain

51. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note that there were none.

52. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that there were none.

53. Minutes

Following a previous request from a Member that the minutes of the Panel meeting held on 4 May 2023 be amended, another Member sought clarification as to the position. The Chair advised that as the meetings were webcast the discussion could be viewed in detail.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2023, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

54. Public Questions

RESOLVED: To note that no questions had been received.

55. Petitions

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received.

56. Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that there were no deputations.

Resolved Items

57. External Presentation - Queens House Car Park

The Panel received a presentation on Queens House Car Park and proposals for the co-living homes, the redevelopment of the site for 468 co-living units with shared internal/external amenity and demolition of the existing car park containing 385 spaces.

During the presentation, Members were advised that.

- The development proposals would facilitate new public realm improvements and the activation of Kymberley Road, bringing residents into the heart of Harrow, supporting the ongoing regeneration and vitality of the town centre.
- The Co-living design would help to foster a sense of community and provide social connections for residents.
- The new homes would be in a well-connected central location to reinforce the town centre.
- Co-living and community use that will benefit the wider community and are easy to access.
- The modular construction had benefits in terms of sustainability, reduced disruption, accelerated delivery and quality and promote more sustainable modes of transport.

Following the presentation, Members asked questions and made comments regarding the proposed development including:

- a request for clarity on more sustainable modes of transport and whether there would be parking on the proposed development. The Panel were advised that there would be cycle parks available for the units and as this development was in the middle of the town centre it would be accessible to all public transport.
- In terms of whether there was any data from previous similar projects regarding this type of co-living worked Members were advised that this is the first to be approved by the Greater London Authority (GLA) but

that there was data from a build to rent scheme which showed engagement in the community areas within those buildings.

- The number of units was proposed for this development was questioned as well as the percentage of occupancy expected and whether these units would be one person per unit or more. The Panel was advised that 468 units for single occupancy were proposed. The up take would be approximately 80-90%.
- In response to a question about parking for the current users of the car park, it was used at 47% capacity and the other car parks nearby could be used.
- The minimum lease on the units would be 3 months.
- No public consultation had taken place as this was the early stages of the application.
- In response to a question, the Panel was advised that there would a large kitchen area on the first floor and small kitchenette in each unit. There would also be dining rooms for hire.
- As the development was using modular construction, there would be minimal disruption to buses during the development.
- In terms of next steps the Panel was advised that there would be a further pre-application but no confirmed date had been confirmed and a detailed management strategy would be provided once the planning application was submitted to the Planning Committee.

RESOLVED: That the presentation be noted.

58. Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Context Report

The Panel received the report, which set out the understanding of infrastructure need and provision across several key areas in Harrow, and a presentation on the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This report was the first step in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) process and would be followed by a programme of internal and external engagement to inform the full IDP.

Following the presentation, Members asked the following questions:

As climate change would have significant impacts in terms of flooding Members questioned the impact of climate change on Harrow, particularly due to the clay soil in and this part of west London. The team had plans for a number of projects, but these would have to be prioritised. Work was also underway to build a better relationship with the water companies to deal with flooding.

In terms of EV charging points and being behind on this, Members were advised that it was necessary to ensure that there was headroom in the

system as having additional EV points meant required electricity to service them. There were ongoing infrastructure projects led by the GLA and West London Alliance to ensure that this was included in the Local Plan and car parking policy.

In response to a question as to whether secondary school provision would be considered further as there was a deficiency in terms of number, the Panel was advised that there was always potential to build secondary schools but finding a site big enough to host the school could be challenging. A site was currently under consideration and would be included the next full version of the IDP.

RESOLVED: That the report and presentation be noted.

59. Harrow Community Infrastructure Levy - Update (September 2023)

Members received a report and presentation which provided an update on the receipts, allocation and expenditure of Harrow Community Infrastructure Levy (HCIL), disaggregated into Borough CIL ('strategic' infrastructure allocated via the Capital Programme) and Neighbourhood CIL (neighbourhood infrastructure / projects allocated via the process agreed by Cabinet in February 2023).

Following the presentation. Members were invited to provide comments, discuss the presentation and ask questions:

- The report required amendment as there was a typographical error in paragraph 5.15 on the 6th line the word borough should really read ward. In addition, the officer undertook check the figures set out on page 4 of the report.
- Clarification on the ward balances and how they were calculated was requested. The table in the report showed the income from the last financial year split into 10% and 5% and that was added to the reallocated balances that went to Cabinet in February, existing balances were reallocated in terms of 10% and 5% not just a new one.

A Member requested that it be noted that in his ward there was a lot of displaced parking issues due to all the developments and that the NCIL money could not be used for the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) review and had to be considered by the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel. The Chair advised that that it was her understanding that a way is being found of using NCIL for traffic and parking management projects without having to go through the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) process.

It was clarified that once the bid form had been submitted and approved, NCIL funds could only be applied for once the ward funds had been used up.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

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

(Signed) Councillor Marilyn Ashton
Chair