

# MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS PANEL MINUTES

## 29 FEBRUARY 2016

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Sue Anderson \* Susan Hall  
\* June Baxter (1) \* David Perry  
\* Stephen Greek \* Kiran Ramchandani

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) Denotes category of Reserve Member

### 51. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Barry Macleod Cullinane

Councillor June Baxter

### 52. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

### 53. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2015, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

### 54. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were asked or petitions or deputations received.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 55. Jubilee House, Merrion Avenue, Stanmore

The Panel received a presentation from Elysian Residences and Collado Collins Architects on proposals to develop and operate assisted living accommodation which would be funded by the sale of an adjacent residential development.

The proposals included discussions with Transport for London (TfL) with regard to the achievement of step free access to Stanmore Station. Members considered the idea of step free access to be positive and recognised that it had been sought by the public for some time.

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

- the anticipated 50 full-time equivalent employees would live in and all would work shifts;
- the site was accessible from the station and the on street parking constraints were acknowledged. A car parking survey of Merrion Avenue indicated that the peak hours were 12.00-1.00 pm with approximately four cars parked by the present office building. It was reported that there were no planning standards for staff car parking and the proposal was for five daytime spaces and additional evening spaces. There would be two short stay parking spaces and a further five for visitors. Research had shown that 50% of residents desired parking. A car free agreement that prevented on-street parking permits for the residents could be considered;
- the underground car parking would allow for sufficient height for ambulances;
- the development would have C2 land classification. There were a number of possible provisions to ensure that residents were of the relevant age and health such as: a minimum age; a legal agreement as to the level of care and commitment to be received or the provision of a minimum number of hours of care each week; a restriction in the lease that it had to be the principle residence; that when the resident died there be a limit on time a young person could be in resident unless they were the spouse;
- discussions had taken place with the refuse teams regarding the location of bins;
- the development had been technically audited by the Fire Brigade;
- facilities to keep residents active and community engaged such as doctors on site with geriatric specialist, lectures, catering facilities were outlined. The gym would be for residents only;

- two public consultations had taken place and only three written feedback forms had expressed concerns at aspects of the proposals. The majority of people in attendance had been local residents who had been reassured that the development was not for permitted development;
- the public at the first consultation had expressed a high level of support for step free station access. Feedback had been obtained to initial sketches at the second consultation evening.

The officer reported that offsetting a degree of affordable housing with step free access was not thought to be viable, either through S106 or CIL. A design had not been submitted as yet.

Although there was insufficient information to enable a considered response, the Council was always sympathetic to step free access. The developer was reminded that it would be necessary to gain authorisation from TfL to undertake development on its site.

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

#### **56. The Former Zoom Leisure Sports Ground, Harrow View West**

The Panel received a presentation from Persimmon Homes on the development proposals consented to date at Harrow View West and the developer's initial thoughts on the potential to enhance the consented scheme. It was noted that it was a GLA referable scheme.

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

- the proposals would result in a significant change to the nature of the development. The block of houses in the centre would become apartments. The consented scheme was for 247 houses and 67 flats whereas the enhanced proposals were for 116 houses and 480 flats;
- the reserved matters scheme had been constrained by what had been consented. Persimmon Homes had seen the opportunity to maximise the delivery of new homes working within the density and parking provisions of the London Plan;
- the proposals were at an early stage and discussions were taking place with planning and highway officers regarding restrictive planning conditions in relation to parking such as use of S106 money and Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). It was acknowledged that there were general parking problems in the area and to offset this consideration was being given to a restrictive condition, perhaps managed by a management company, that prevented the purchase of resident permits elsewhere;

- the parking profile for flats was slightly different to houses. Parking provision of one car per house was under consideration with parking for sale for flats if wanted.

A Member expressed the view that the original scheme balanced out the proposals for the Kodak scheme as it predominately consisted of houses, for which there was a desperate need in the area, and this scheme had been well received. The new proposals substantially reduced the housing element and reduced the parking provision, and there was concern expressed about the scale of development and the impact on the surrounding area.

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

#### **57. Update on Various Projects**

The Head of Development Management updated the Panel on the status of major development projects in Harrow which provided summary data on each scheme.

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

#### **58. Future Topics and Presentations**

**RESOLVED:** That reports be submitted to the next meeting on:

- (1) the current Civic Centre site and replacement site;
- (2) general strategy for major development in Harrow.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.10 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair