

The Wealdstone Project

Community Design Drop-in 2 Findings Report

Prepared by Daisy Froud
for Gort Scott Architects and Harrow Council

01

SUMMARY FINDINGS

This summarises the key findings from the second public ‘design drop-in’ on The Wealdstone Project: the project to design a new civic building - a replacement for Harrow’s current Civic Centre – in Wealdstone town centre. The event took place on Saturday 6 May 2017, from 11am to 6pm at Red Brick Café, The Wealdstone Centre. A drop-in exhibition ran all day, with more formal presentations and Q&A sessions with the project team, followed by site tours, at 12 noon and 3pm. *For those who are interested, a full-length report, with full details of community feedback, is also available.*

Who participated?

Approximately 136 people attended the event. Approximately 90 people attended a Q&A session. 68 feedback forms were completed.

93% of those attending classified themselves as ‘local residents’ as opposed to businesspeople or ‘other’.

What was shown and discussed?

The team were still at quite an early stage in the design process. They did not therefore show full detailed architectural proposals, but instead focused on communicating ideas for overall site strategy, having used Event 1 to help draw out community priorities to inform this. They summarised the proposals as “initial concept designs”.

The display presented proposals for (i) layout of the site, (ii) height and shape of buildings, and (iii) likely functions/ activities to be accommodated in different buildings. This included different possibilities for site layout in response to the possible inclusion of the Palmerston Road ashram in the scheme. The design team felt it important to ‘check in’ with the people of Harrow regarding the overall concept before progressing further, gaining feedback to inform the next stage of design.

All display material was made available after the event on the project website www.thewealdstoneproject.com

What were the main things that people liked about the proposals?

- 1. Regeneration potential for Wealdstone:** this was by far the most commonly praised aspect. They liked the bold move of bringing the centre of local government to a different part of the borough, with accompanying investment, increase in footfall and rise in status and the change this might bring to the High Street. There are hoped that the new buildings will give the town centre a face lift and help change perceptions of the area.
- 2. The roof garden/terrace for public use:** This makes the building attractive, brings greenery to the area and offers benefits in terms of local air quality. People like the idea of weddings and events being held up there, and of the views.
- 3. The creation of better-defined connections between the High Street, Canning Road and Byron Park,** with Peel Road feeling more like a continuous route.
- 4. The reduction in height of the main civic building since the first event** – this seemed more in keeping with the area and to be a better neighbour to nearby buildings.
- 5. The overall look and feel of the main civic building.** Many participants praised the architecture, in particular **its ‘stepped’ or ‘staggered’ form.** “The structure leads your eyeline up rather than looking imposing”, said one participant.
- 6. The thought given to parking and vehicle movement since the first event.** People liked the idea of putting parking underground, and that there was capacity for public parking as well as Council staff.
- 7. The overall layout of the site** and location of the main civic building.

What were the main concerns or questions about the proposals?

- 1. Availability of adequate parking remains a major concern**, despite the improvements in strategy since the last event. People are concerned as to where Civic Centre visitors, town centre shoppers and residents of the proposed new flats will park - especially at times of day when Civic Centre staff may be occupying many of the available spaces - and the likely impact on existing residents in nearby streets. It was stressed that whatever the ideal, not everyone uses public transport. People were also keen to look at solutions though, such as car pooling for Civic Centre staff, or tightening up of CPZ restrictions.
- 2. The proposed residential tower.** This concerned people on a number of fronts: (a) height and the visual impact of this on the neighbourhood, (b) possible lack of accompanying social and transport infrastructure (such as GPs, schools, trains), (c) likely ownership and tenure – fears of expensive flats for buy-to-let landlords that do not really address local housing need, (d) likely quality of the homes internally, (e) a sense of overdevelopment of the area, especially when considered alongside other new schemes underway, and accompanying concerns about loss of Wealdstone’s character and reduction of quality of life for existing residents.
- 3. Height in general** remains a concern, although there is appreciation of efforts made to reduce that of the main civic building. People would like height to be kept as low as possible.
- 4. Approach to roads and routes within the scheme:** a number of people felt that this needed more careful consideration. There are worries about: (a) how and if shared surfaces will work in reality, and how safe these will be, (b) whether the routes work as well as they might for cyclists in terms of making connections, and (c) the nature of change that is required to Gladstone Way and/or George Gange Way to make the landscaped spaces work the way they do in the drawings e.g. concerns that Canning Road might become a rat run.
- 5. Impacts of construction:** there are so many major schemes locally, that people worry about the cumulative effect of noise, dust and traffic, as well as the impact upon local businesses of temporary loss of customer parking during the construction period. Will the Council have proper mitigation and construction and traffic management plans in place? They would like to see these once available.

What other important questions or issues did people raise?

- 1. What measures are being taken to address crime and anti-social behaviour in the scheme’s public spaces/ Wealdstone town centre?** It’s naïve to assume that just because council staff are on site that drug dealing won’t occur. Late evenings and weekends? Are a particular concern. People want to know how public space will be managed, how the architects are working ‘design out crime’ and what ‘community safety’ measures will be implemented.
- 2. What specific measures are being implemented to ensure that the scheme is ‘green’, energy-efficient and sustainable?** E.g energy capture (ground source, photovoltaics), renewable energy, SUDS? Will the scheme fit in to the mooted district heating plans for the area?
- 3. How will the scheme benefit existing local residents in need of homes?** How affordable is ‘affordable’ housing for local people e.g someone on £20k per year? Will there be social housing units?
- 4. What are the economics of and the business case for the scheme?** People were keen to have the figures shared with them in order to understand the Council’s strategy and how decisions have been taken and risk managed. They were also keen to know whether the Council is selling land assets to fund the scheme, or taking out loans with the assets as collateral.
- 5. They also stressed the importance of:** (a) **providing adequate green space** – particularly if building dense flats without their own gardens, (b) **retaining existing facilities** on the site such as the library and the café, (c) **undertaking proper advance strategic planning to manage traffic flow and parking** before the development starts.

How well do people think the design team are doing overall?

We asked people “**having looked at our concept proposals, how well do you think we have responded to public feedback from previous consultation**”, and then to give us a score on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning ‘not at all’ and 5 meaning ‘extremely well’.

46 people responded to this question. **The majority (27.5 people) gave a positive score – 4 or 5 out of 5 - with 7 of these scoring the team 5 out of 5.** 12.5 people gave a neutral score of 3 out of 5. And 6 people gave a negative score of 1 or 2 out of 5.

02

INTRODUCTION

02.1 ABOUT THE EVENT

- This was the second major public drop-in event looking at the design of a new 'civic campus' for LB Harrow, in Wealdstone town centre, replacing the Civic Centre on Station Road.
- It was held on Saturday 06 May 2017 at Red Brick Café, The Wealdstone Centre, High Street, Wealdstone. It was a drop-in event, from 11am to 6pm.
- Material was mostly presented through an exhibition, plus a large model showing proposals set within the surrounding neighbourhood. Timed presentations and Q&A sessions, with lead architect Jay Gort and Harrow Council's Director of Regeneration Paul Nichols, followed by tours of the proposed site, were held at 12 noon and 3pm.
- Feedback was gathered primarily via written feedback forms.
- Refreshments and children's craft activities were provided.

02.2 AIMS OF THE EVENT

- Show the local community initial concept designs for (i) layout of the site, (ii) height and shape of proposed buildings, and (iii) likely functions/activities to be accommodated in different buildings.
- Gain feedback on these to inform the next stages of the design.
- Update the community on progress since the initial event in January 2017. Although detailed design of the character of the buildings, landscaping around them, and interior spaces, had not yet begun, it was important to 'check in' with the people of Harrow regarding the overall concept before progressing further. This included sharing different possibilities for site layout in response to the possible inclusion of the Palmerston Road ashram (the International Siddhashram Shakti Center) in the scheme.
- Show the community how the design team had responded to feedback from previous events (the drop-in in January 2017 and two 'architectural character' workshops in March 2017) and provide more information in response to questions raised. For example, the main transport consultant was present all day to discuss questions and concerns directly with local people.
- Allow people who had not attended previously to learn more about plans, and meet the design and project team.

02.3 WHO PARTICIPATED?

- Approximately 136 people attended. (Some entered without registering, particularly during busy periods.)
- Approximately 50 people attended the 12 noon Q&A session, and approximately 40 attended the 3pm one.
- 68 feedback forms were completed. Most of these were completed on the day.
- Everyone who attended was asked to complete an Equality Monitoring Form, to help us ensure that we engage with a representative cross-section of Harrow's population. 55 of these were completed. The information given suggests the following, in relationship to average figures for the borough sourced from the 2011 Census (http://www.harrow.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/5408/2011_2013_harrow_vitality_profiles):
 - **Age:** participants were relatively old. Of the 55 people who answered the relevant question, 76% were over 45 years old. 28% were over 65 years old, compared to 14% of the borough's population. Unsurprisingly for this kind of event, only three of those completing a form were under 24.
 - **Ethnicity:** participants were relatively White. (65% of those answering the relevant question on the form, compared to 42% of the borough's resident population.) 28% of those completing a form defined themselves as of Asian ethnicity, compared to 44% in the Census.
 - **Religion:** a relatively high proportion of those who answered this question were without religion (26% compared to 9.6% in the borough). 40% were Christian (tallying with 37% in the borough) and 17% were Hindu, compared to 25% of the population. However, it should be noted that only 64% of those completing a feedback form chose to answer this question.
- *The above observations are not a criticism of those who did attend! (One participant, having read the equivalent from Event 1, said he now felt that he was the "wrong kind of person", which was not the idea at all!) It is simply that, if we are (i) designing a civic building that 'belongs' to, and it is representative of, the borough as a whole, (ii) running an engagement process to involve residents of the borough as a whole, and (iii) taking their combined feedback as representative of the opinion of Harrow's residents, it's important to be aware of how 'representative' the total group of*

participants we are talking with is. Not everyone wants to, or can, attend a drop-in event. We should keep holding them – they are very valuable - but crunching the data in this way allows us to decide what extra activities to hold to reach a wider cross-section of population. For example, we have held meetings with different voluntary and community sector groups, and done additional work with young people studying for A-level and BTEC qualifications at Harrow College.

- The majority (93%) of those who answered the relevant question classified themselves as 'local residents', as opposed to 'businesspeople' or 'other'.
- People found out about the event through a wide variety of means, in some cases multiple. The main method was a flyer/letter through the door (30%) followed by an email from Daisy Froud (25%), followed by a poster (22%). A number of participants told us that they had found out about the event simply by walking past – an advantage of using a venue that is directly visible from, and opening onto, the High St, on a busy Saturday.

03

THINGS THAT PEOPLE LIKED ABOUT THE CONCEPT PROPOSALS

Points made by community participants in the course of the two Q&A sessions are integrated in blue text at the relevant points in the discussion below, to help create one integrated set of event 'findings'.

Main points of praise

3.1 Regeneration potential for Wealdstone - by far the most commonly praised aspect. People liked the bold move of bringing the centre of local government to a different part of the borough, with accompanying investment, bringing more people into the area and raising its status - and the change that this might bring to the High Street. The current car park building, while very *useful*, is not attractive; its replacement should give the town centre a face lift and help change perceptions of the area. People have been waiting for something like this to happen to Wealdstone for a while. [This point was also stressed at the Q&A sessions.](#)

3.2 The roof garden/terrace for public use: this is a very popular feature. It makes the building attractive, brings greenery to the area and offer benefits in terms of local air quality. People like the idea of holding weddings and events there, and of the views. It was suggested that a gas connection be built in to facilitate events e.g. BBQs, or a cafe be provided. However, one participant sounded concerns regarding possible costs of upkeep, and a number of people stressed that it was vital for the terrace to be public and open to all e.g not just staff. It was also suggested that appropriate uses should be found for all roofs. [This aspect was also stressed at the Q&A sessions.](#)

3.3 Creation of better and better-defined connections between the High Street, Canning Road and Byron Park, with Peel Road feeling more like a continuous route.

3.4 Reduction in height of the main civic building – this seemed more in keeping with the area and to be a better neighbour to nearby buildings.

3.5 The overall look and feel of the main civic building. Many participants praised the architecture and there was particular praise for its **'stepped' or 'staggered' form**. "The structure leads your eyeline up rather than looking imposing".

3.6 The thought given to parking and vehicle movement since January. People liked the idea of putting parking underground, and that there was capacity for public parking as well as Council staff. Praise came for different reasons: "as much parking as possible" said one person, while another praised efforts to reduce it.

3.7 The overall layout of the site and location of the main civic building.

Other points praised by more than one person

3.8 The way in which the campus aims to sit well alongside Wealdstone's existing architecture, through its shape and materials.

3.9 The emphasis on bringing light into the building.

3.10 The emphasis on greenery and green spaces.

3.11 The focus on energy-saving and sustainability – both in terms of saving money for the Council and wider environmental benefits.

3.12 The open-ness and visibility of some of the inside spaces. There was particular praise for making the Council Chamber more visible, so that it feels more accessible and brings politics into the community.

3.13 The removal of the clock tower from the scheme shown in January. Not everyone had been convinced by its design or felt that another clock was necessary in Wealdstone.

3.14 Improvements to pavements and walkways.

3.15 The Council's focus on strategic thinking and future-proofing, including using this project to help save money and even raise revenue in the long term.

3.16 The focus on being a community building.

3.17 The proposals for the ground floor, including the open café space.

3.18 Potential associated improvements to the safety and security of the High Street area, including at night.

Some people also had praise for the display materials, saying that they found them clear and understandable.

Other points of praise by individuals: emphasis on good architecture; the trees (as a characteristic of Wealdstone); increase in benches; inclusion of office space to help provide jobs in Harrow; proposed ground floor uses; the lighting; the spaces for weddings and events (could there be licensing for alcohol – as there are no pubs nearby to go to afterwards?); provision of housing and new ashram; cycle storage; flexible working for staff; outside spaces with areas for play; retention of the library; proposals for development of the square; the absence of a staff canteen, meaning that footfall will be provided to the High Street ([the importance of this was also stressed at the Q&A sessions](#)).

04

THINGS THAT PEOPLE THOUGHT WORKED LESS WELL ABOUT THE CONCEPT PROPOSALS

Points made by community participants in the course of the two Q&A sessions are integrated in blue text at the relevant points in the discussion below, to help create one integrated set of event 'findings'.

Main points of concern

4.1 Availability of adequate parking remains a major concern, although people appreciated the effort put into thinking about it. It was stressed that, whatever the ideal, not everyone uses public transport. Concerns include:

- Where visitors to the Civic Centre will park; will they end up in nearby residential streets? Local residents remain concerned that the project team is not paying adequate attention to impact in this regard. Suggestions included adapting the CPZ to be residents only, not permit holders.
- Where town centre shoppers will park if staff have taken all the spaces.
- Where residents of new homes in the tower will park. People want to see parking provided for them.
- Whether the ashram proposal will generate parking problems.

People also want to ensure that the Council is thinking long term e.g. if/when Crossrail comes and more residents move into the area, will there be a problem with more commuters wanting to park near the station? They also had suggestions for how to meet demand in the present e.g. develop the station car park to 2 or 3 storeys.

Parking was also an ongoing concern at Q&A sessions, with cynicism about the idea that people who rent (i.e. those who might move into the new development) don't have cars. People also wanted information about how parking will be paid for. Participants were keen to talk solutions as well e.g. a suggestion that it is better to remove the need for cars than to just put in parking spaces – Brent Council apparently has a 'car pool'.

1.2 The proposed residential tower. This concerned people on a number of fronts, with some uncertainty about why it is required and what it offers to the neighbourhood:

- **Height:** especially with so many other tall buildings going up so quickly in the area. (People are very concerned about the Palmerston Road twin towers and that these may already be setting a new precedent.) One participant suggested that a staggered form, like that of the proposed Civic Centre, might be more appropriate. There is fear that a building this tall could become an eyesore e.g. with all the things that people place on balconies.
- **Lack of accompanying infrastructure:** more and more housing is being proposed for the area (thousands of people at the Kodak site for example) without parallel increase in health and education services, or in already stretched public transport or local sewer capacity. There is also a worry that the local road network will become overloaded. [This point was also stressed at the Q&A sessions, with participants stressing that the Council must keep making the case to TfL and Network Rail for more train services.](#)
- **Ownership and tenure:** Concern that homes will go to buy-to-let investors and absentee landlords, and just be used as commuter dormitories. There is a lack of good, affordable or social, family housing in the area.
- **Likely quality of the homes:** concern that not enough of the flats will be dual or triple aspect.
- **Overdevelopment in general in the town centre.** People fear the impact on quality of life of existing residents (e.g. access to daylight and sunlight) and on the Wealdstone's character. "The Victorian origins of Wealdstone are gradually being overwhelmed." [This was also a big discussion topic at Q&A sessions, with questions about why so much housing is needed and concerns about the impacts of population expansion. In response, the Director of Regeneration explained that, while and as a London borough Harrow does have to help meet London housing targets, demand is not all from outside the borough – but from changes to household type and size among existing residents.](#)

1.3 Height. This was a specific concern with regard to the tower (above) but also a concern re the wider development, although people did appreciate that work had been done to reduce this. They would like height to be kept as low as possible. [This was also an ongoing concern at Q&A sessions.](#)

I.4 Approach to roads and routes within the scheme: a number of people felt that this needed more careful consideration. There are worries about:

- shared surfaces and their safety (unless marked well, with subsequent impact upon aesthetics) i.e. interaction between pedestrians and cyclists, and between both these groups and cars
- whether the routes could be made to work better for cyclists in terms of linking into existing desire lines e.g. Headstone Drive to Peel Road (the suggestion was made that the team talk to Harrow Cyclists)
- whether Gladstone Way needs to remain a road – is it shaping the architecture too much?
- Why George Gange Way needs to be made to ‘not feel like a bypass’ when it is one.
- Could Canning Rd be closed off going on to George Gange Way as it could become a rat run?

Similar concerns were raised at the Q&A sessions, with some scepticism about how the new system will be managed, or how mis-use will be prevented.

I.5 Possible impacts of construction upon the neighbourhood: there are so many major schemes locally, that people worry about the cumulative effect of so much noise, dust and traffic, as well as impact upon local businesses of temporary loss of customer parking during construction. Will the Council have proper mitigation and construction and traffic management plans in place? People would like to see these once available. This was also a major topic of discussion at Q&A sessions, with the Director of Regeneration stressing that the Council *will* need to prepare construction management plans and consider these issues properly.

Other points of concern for more than one person

I.6 Proposed ashram scheme: people are not sure about the proposed land swap and move. It was not clear however whether those concerns were on behalf of ashram users, or to do with the bigger picture.

I.7 Traffic flow, including the impact of the traffic calming. (No further detail given.) [Traffic congestion caused by the new scheme, in an already congested area, was an additional ongoing concern at the Q&A sessions.](#)

Points of concern for individuals: landscaping could be more adventurous, with perhaps more opportunity for seating - although play is encouraged could it be more open?; whether adequate measures are being taken to address anti-social behaviour; that architecture seems to be being naively proposed to solve wider social and economic issues; that the building looks rather utilitarian from some angles; the hidden location of the Centre behind the ugly Wealdstone Centre; the rood terrace should not be Council staff – overlooking the High Street – ALL the time but for residents only some of the time; lack of information about access for disabled people; whether the Civic Centre building is large enough for Council needs, even with hot-desking; might the entrance to the Civic Centre work better on Gladstone Way rather than at the side?

05

ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

We asked people whether they had any further feedback that they would like to give us. Points have not been repeated here if they have already been reported in detail in previous sections.

Points made by community participants in the course of the two Q&A sessions are integrated in blue text at the relevant points in the discussion below, to help create one integrated set of event 'findings'.

Additional questions

From multiple participants

5.1 What measures are being taken to address crime and anti-social behaviour in the scheme's public spaces/ Wealdstone town centre? Will there be more security and police? CCTV and increased (LED) lighting? It's naïve to assume that just because council staff are on site that drug dealing won't occur. What about late evenings and weekends? One participant stressed however that there shouldn't be police/wardens wandering about making the place look like a prison. Another gave the example of New York Mayor Ed Koch who had reduced anti-social behaviour simply by consistently fixing things that needed fixing (broken windows, lights, potholes in the road etc.). [How public space will be managed, and the need to 'design out crime' and implement 'community safety' measures was also a theme at Q&A sessions. There was some cynicism about the reality of being able to address this.](#)

5.2 What specific measures will ensure that the scheme is 'green', energy-efficient and sustainable? E.g energy capture (ground source, photovoltaics), renewable energy, SUDS? Ideally the building should be carbon neutral. This included how the scheme might fit into the mooted district heating system for the area. One participant felt that non car users should be given priority; another that any car clubs provided should use electric or hybrid vehicles.

5.4 How will the scheme benefit existing residents in need of homes? How affordable is 'affordable' housing for local people e.g someone on £20k per year? Will there be social housing? Ideally the Council will retain ownership of as much as the property as possible. [This point was also stressed at the Q&A sessions.](#)

Additional questions were raised at Q&A sessions about the scheme's economics and business case. People were keen to see the figures and to be convinced that this was a better option than refurbishing the existing Civic Centre, and not costing the tax payer too much, or getting the Council into a risky financial position. Others emphasised how important it is for the Council to hold on to land assets, such as the existing Civic Centre site. The Director of Regeneration stressed that these were all important questions, and had been weighed up very carefully. The Council is raising money through a combination of keeping and selling assets. They would love to keep all the land, but there is a limit to how much can be borrowed or serviced as a loan.

From individuals

5.5 Where development options are being considered, could these be presented with comparative data on the project website?

5.6 What's the plan for improvement to Premier House ground floor? It needs lots of work!

At the Q&A sessions it was asked:

- How Brexit might affect the project,
- What the Council is doing to improve employment opportunities in the area. The Director of Regeneration responded that the Council is really trying to push workspace provisions and development wherever it can.
- Whether there will be shops in the scheme. The Director of Regeneration explained that the idea is not to create new shops, but to bring footfall into the area to stimulate the existing High Street.

Additional concern from multiple participants

5.7 Loss of local character. Fear that Wealdstone will lose its human scale and start to turn into east Croydon: “a soul-less jumble of concrete and glass with the odd older building”. There is also concern that small local businesses will be affected negatively by this kind of change.

Additional points stressed

From multiple participants

5.8 Green spaces are important, particularly for people living in dense areas with lots of garden-less flats. They should be maximised within the scheme.

5.9 Existing facilities – e.g the library, café and HAD office - **should be kept.** It’s also important that they keep a High Street presence. The CAB could move into the area with the building.

5.10 That the development is A Good Thing for the area: people stressed the ‘golden opportunity’ it offered Wealdstone which, after all, is “geographically at the centre of Harrow”.

5.11 Need for proper advance strategic planning to manage traffic flow and parking before development starts. The changes to Harrow Town Centre were cited as an example of unsympathetic traffic management with negative impacts on businesses and customers.

From individuals

5.12 “PLEASE no slippery flooring like they have in the local shopping centre.”

5.13 “Need more tables/chairs for outside; enjoy outside.”

5.14 “It all looks good - but it is invasive on the whole community.”

5.15 “Don’t strive for an exceptional building. Make it good and pleasant to work in and visit.”

5.16 More cycle routes needed - need to MERGE better from Wealdstone to central London or Shepherds Bush.

Additional points made at the Q&A sessions

- Need to tackle the rat problem in the town centre.
- One couple shared with fellow participants that they are quite new to the area, and really grateful to have found a home somewhere like Wealdstone with such a good community. They don’t own a car, and think that others like them will also come, keen to be able to afford a home and settle down.
- Another older couple told us that they had grown up in Dalston, Hackney, and could remember when it was completely rundown. But now look! People may find it hard to believe, but this is almost certainly what will happen to Wealdstone. “The time has come for Wealdstone to have the same.”
- It’s important that the Council clearly communicates that the Palmerston Road town towers are nothing to do with them, and that they even turned down planning permission, as many people think the opposite.

Additional suggestions

For the scheme

5.17 Involve the Council’s trade unions as full project partners. As the project will inevitably affect refuse collection, street cleaning, public lighting, sewerage etc., members will be able to offer expertise on practicalities at ground level.

5.18 Keep the stained glass Whitefriars window from the old Civic Centre: it’s important history and would be good for photos at weddings etc.

5.19 Allocate part of the scheme to Youth Development Services of all sorts to discourage anti-social behaviour and encourage positive community spirit and enterprise.

5.20 Ensure good integration of the ground floor of Premier House to the Civic Centre so that people can walk straight through rather than having to walk round.

5.21 Good to have a dedicated space for local groups to use free of charge to publicise themselves i.e. local horticultural groups or special interest groups.

5.22 Can the new Ashram have room for public use/hire?

5.23 Put an arched sign to Byron Park on the High Street footpath to emphasise how close it is.

For the wider area

5.23 Pedestrianise the whole High Street.

5.24 Encourage development of land around George Gange way for retail parks, joining Travis Perkins to retail park area near leisure centre.

5.25 Consider other sites for development such as Greenhill Way or the old Civic Centre site.
At the Q&A session it was stressed that more 186 buses to Edgware are needed, and that it would be lovely to have some little wooden animals for children to play on in the new Wealdstone Square.

Feedback on the process

From multiple participants

5.26 As much information, opportunities to meet and publicity about these meetings as possible are all needed throughout the process as decisions are taken.

5.27 Good amplification/microphones needed at all events.

5.28 Could hard copies of the material shown be made easily available, as handouts or in a longer-term display in the library?

Similar points were made at the Q&A sessions.

From individuals

5.29 Helpful, enthusiastic staff who are willing to listen.

5.30 Q&A session: positive and informative.

5.31 Project Team are doing a good job of listening to feedback so far.

5.32 Councillors need to attend these events to explain the financial 'benefits' for tax and council tax payers and to give the longer term strategy for Harrow specifically, as opposed to London.

5.33 Do not show high building views in Summer! Show them in Winter when leaves do not obscure them.

5.34 More information about the M&E services would be good

At the Q&A sessions the importance of involving young people was also stressed.

06

DESIGN TEAM RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK FROM EVENT I

We asked people “having looked at our concept proposals, how well do you think we have responded to public feedback from previous consultation”.

6.1 On a scale of 1 to 5 participants responded:

1 (not at all)	4 people
2	2 person
3	12.5 people
4	20.5 people
5 (extremely well)	7 people

6.2 Reasons for low scores

- Not responded to concerns re height. New building is higher than the last one.
- Not listening to concerns of local residents. Moving plans around to make it look different but its all in disguise.
- It still feels like you're doing what you want.
- You have included another ugly tower block to blight the skyline and area. No thought or consideration for people living in nearby homes - this will devalue homes.
- Not been to others; only heard comments.

6.3 Reasons for a midway score

- Some issues addressed.
- Public feedback can only be given extremely limited attention. The priority in all of this is funding/profit.
- Changed design of CC and environment – good. NOT good the new build multi-storey accommodation
- The new tower block was sneaked in.
- No residents’ request for large residential development.
- Only so much that can be detailed on boards. Will have to wait and see final plans.
- Lack of response to concern about crime and anti-social behaviour in relation to space between Red Brick Café and Lloyds Bank and the car park behind.
- Impact on parking for existing residents.

6.4 Reasons for high scores

- Reconsideration of height.
- Clear reference to parking being a problem for residents in surrounding roads.
- Designs have moved on and look much better.
- I can see they took on board a lot of our comments.
- Looks like you're really responding to feedback and taking it into account considering the important issues as the plans progress.
- Positive questions and knowledgeable response.
- Trying to cover to types of questions from residents etc.
- Lower height - impressive. Pleased to know we have roof terrace!
- The improvement to the High St - not just buildings.
- Roof garden, privacy for neighbours, highlighting current issues i.e. gangs, drugs.
- only so much that can be detailed on boards. Will have to wait and see final plans.
- people's ideas are featured
- The ideas being considered will address the needs of the civic centre but also the area and its residents/businesses.
- There are many quotes from members of the public. I am glad that you have taken in the suggestion that the new building should be decorative and of its time, not blocky or sloppy like some new buildings.

- Issues I remember from first consultation seem to have been addressed.
- You are thinking about parking issues. You have tried to change the civic centre by removing the air shaft. I would love a bit more traditional design with maybe Clock Tower.
- So far it still remains how not sufficiently determined. We will have to see like the plans are finalised. It is always concerning to hear that further residential builds are considered to finance the project.