

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL MINUTES

19 SEPTEMBER 2012

Chairman: * Councillor Keith Ferry (in the Chair)

Councillors: * Tony Ferrari * Barry Macleod-Cullinane
* Susan Hall * Varsha Parmar (3)
* Thaya Idaikkadar * Navin Shah

In attendance: Joyce Nickolay Minutes 94 and 95.
(Councillors)

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

87. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Bill Stephenson

Councillor Varsha Parmar

88. Appointment of Chairman for the meeting

In the absence of the Chairman and given the fact that a Vice-Chairman had not yet been appointed, nominations were sought for the appointment of a Chairman for the meeting.

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor Keith Ferry as Chairman for the meeting.

89. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interest was declared:

Agenda Items 9 – Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital; 10 Future Working Arrangements of the Panel; 11 Update on Various Projects

Councillor Susan Hall declared a personal interest in that she had a business in Wealdstone. She would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

90. Appointment of Vice-Chairman

RESOLVED: To appoint Councillor Keith Ferry as Vice-Chairman of the Major Developments Panel for the 2012/2013 Municipal Year.

91. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2012, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

92. Terms of Reference of the Major Developments Panel

The Panel received its Terms of Reference, which were for noting.

RESOLVED: That the terms of reference for the Major Developments Panel be noted and confirmed.

93. Public Questions, Petitions, Deputations

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

RESOLVED ITEMS

94. Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital

Members received a presentation from the officers in conjunction with representatives of the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital and its architects. It was noted that planning permission had been granted by Harrow Council in 2007 and renewed in 2010. The scheme was slightly larger than the extant permission due to subsequent land purchases. During the course of the presentation the Panel was informed of the approved development zones and parameter plan, green linkages, access and tree surveys. Two public consultations had taken place and the development zones had been revised as a result. The Panel was informed that the developer was mindful that the northern amenity zone should be treated positively.

Following the presentation, Members asked questions and made comments which were responded to as follows:

- the present state of public sector finances was a key reason why value was sought in the western zone. Full government approval had been obtained for the private finance initiative (PFI) and a detailed application for the bid was being progressed. Whilst some underlying borrowing would be required, it would be less than in the NHS generally;
- the western zone would include 93 housing units (3-5+ bedrooms) and a viability report was expected to confirm that social housing was not required. The eastern zone would include approximately 300 properties ranging from 1 bedroom flats to 4 bedroom houses. This would include affordable key worker and intermediate housing for staff for which a preference had been expressed rather than social housing due to sustainability;
- the role of the planning authority would be critical regarding the viability of the phasing of the project which would be based on the market prices at the time. The rebalancing of proposals could be required due to changes in housing value;
- the majority of the housing element was two storey plus a mansard roof with some three storey. Whilst the car park was proposed to be seven storeys, the floor depth was less than the clinical storeys and there would be some digging into the hillside. The hospital buildings varied between three, four and five storeys plus plant;
- there was a blanket Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The officer outlined the tree categories and stated that category A trees would be retained unless the buildings were affected. Replacement would be based on the age of the trees rather than overall numbers. The tree structure would provide a buffer to the hospital buildings;
- the north to south road, marked blue on the map, would be constructed once the theatres had been demolished;
- there would be a fifteen year development programme with submission of a detailed application for phase one at the end of 2013, an anticipated start on site mid 2014 and completion mid 2015;
- the timing of the green belt improvements had not yet been finalised and discussion would take place as to the continued management of access and facilities. Should discussions with the third sector not progress, the liability would remain with the Trust and would require a Section 106 Agreement. Final Heads of Terms had not yet been agreed;
- the Planning Authority was clear on the long term aspiration to improve public transport access to the site;
- with regard to security the site use was currently spread out and was not well lit so would be improved by consolidation on site. Ongoing

dialogue was taking place with the police on cohesion and potential trespass issues. Advice would be taken from the police as to whether gated properties were desirable.

The Chairman thanked the officers and representatives for the presentation and commented that it had been helpful for the Panel to understand the type of development proposed. He emphasised that the meeting was not part of the pre application process. The Panel were in agreement that it was a vital development for the borough.

RESOLVED: That the presentation and the Panel's comments thereon be noted.

95. Future Working Arrangements of the Panel

The Panel was asked by officers to review the functioning of the Panel and to suggest improvements for both the community and Members.

A Member suggested the arrangement of informal meetings involving interested members from both Groups to discuss their vision to develop parameters in order to provide a unified approach where applicable. The Panel agreed that the uncertainty in the period leading up to an election concerned developers lest the winning party had a different approach to development.

Members discussed the following:

- whilst contributions from stakeholder representatives or interest groups would be welcomed, the constitution required formal appointments to be made which did not provide sufficient flexibility;
- focusing on one development at a meeting would be beneficial but the timetable could result in two or three developments;
- the Core Strategy would advise developers as to what would be considered acceptable in an area;
- the opportunity could be taken to merge the responsibilities of the Panel with the Local Development Framework Panel which was nearing completion of its workload;
- a joint proactive approach by the two Groups would help the Panel realise the potential investment in the Area Action Plan by promoting Harrow to developers;
- the impact of development on other services such as transport and schools should be recorded in order to provide an overall picture;
- the Localism Act, Place West London, the Core Strategy, Area Action Plan and the Panel all had a part to play;

RESOLVED: That the officers report back to the next meeting on progress.

96. Update on Various Projects

The Panel received and considered a schedule which provided progress on various sites around the borough.

The Divisional Director of Planning reported that the administrators of Bradstowe House had exchanged contracts and hoped to complete at the end of September. In response to a question, officers undertook to contact the receivers regarding security at the site and to provide an update on the debt with regard to the encroachment and weekly increase. It was noted that there was a longstanding licence regarding encroachment onto the pavement. The Secretary of State had made it clear that the Section 106 Agreement should be renegotiated. Regard would need to be given to the legislative changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The Panel noted that the Planning Committee had agreed outline planning permission for the Kodak site pending completion of a Section 106 Agreement and response from the Government Office for London.

In response to a question, the Panel was informed that the impacts of the interconnections between projects were tracked by the officers.

RESOLVED: That the content of the schedule of strategic sites be noted.

97. Future Topics and Presentations

Members considered which items they would like to receive at their next meeting. The officers undertook to report back on proposals for the future working arrangements for the Panel together with a report on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the infrastructure plan.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.35 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY
Chairman