

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 - REPORT NO. 81

MEETING TITLE AND DATE
Council 21 September 2016

REPORT OF:

Director of Finance, Resources and
Customer Services
Contact officer: Penelope Williams
Tel: 020 8379 4098
E mail: penelopewilliams1958@gmail.com

Agenda - Part: 1	Item: 14
Subject: Trent Park Working Group Report back to Council	
Wards: Cockfosters Key Decision No: Not required	
Cabinet Members consulted: Councillors Alan Sitkin, Daniel Anderson and Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member) Other Members: Councillors Terry Neville, Joanne Laban, Anne Marie Pearce and Jason Charalambous.	

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report attached as Appendix A summarises and reports back to Council on the work of the Trent Park Working Group. The working group was a cross party group made up of three members from each political party. It was set up by Council to monitor the situation with regard to the former Middlesex University buildings and land at Trent Park.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 To note the contents of the report as set out in Appendix A.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 At the Council meeting held on March 2015 members received a petition from local residents concerned about the fate of the former Middlesex University Buildings in Trent Park. They were keen to make sure that the historic mansion house was preserved and that the grounds could be accessible to the general public.

- 3.2 In response the Council decided to set up a working group to monitor the situation. The working group was a cross party group made up of three members from each of the political parties and chaired by Councillor Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member).
- 3.3 At the time the site was in the hands of receivers, JLL (Jones Lang LaSalle Incorporated). They then sold the property to a housing developer, Berkeley Homes.
- 3.4 Over the past year the working group has met with senior representatives from Berkeley Homes and monitored the development of the proposals for the house and grounds. These include restoring the mansion and other historic buildings, recreating the landscape gardens, removing the former 60's and 70's university buildings as well as building new homes for sale in keeping with the parkland setting.
- 3.5 Plans are also being put together to open up some of the stately rooms within the mansion for a museum and community space.
- 3.6 Berkeley Homes are now ready to submit a planning application for their proposals.
- 3.7 Throughout the proceedings the working group members were aware that they were not part of the formal planning process.
- 3.8 At the end of the process the Chair commented that he had been impressed by the level and quality of the public consultation carried out.
- 3.9 Council is asked to note the work carried out as set out in further detail in the attached report. Appendix A.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Not applicable.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

To report back to Council on the issues considered by the Working Group.

6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

6.1 Financial Implications

There are no financial implications to note at this stage of the report.

6.2 Legal Implications

Any proposed development of the site will require planning permission pursuant to section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and perhaps in addition, due to the fact that the house and numerous other structures are grade II listed, listed building consent pursuant to the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 may also be required.

Statutory consultation for any such proposals will be carried out by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

7. KEY RISKS

The working group was set up to enable the Council to monitor the fate of the former Middlesex University buildings and grounds, to ensure that they were not neglected and that a viable solution could be found so that they could be preserved for the benefit of the local community and future residents of the borough.

There was a risk if a developer had not been found who was prepared to take on the restoration that the buildings could have been neglected and fallen into disrepair. Another risk was the development proposed would have taken no account of the historic aspects or denied the public access to the site.

8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

8.1 Fairness for All, Growth and Sustainability and Strong Communities

The Council were concerned to find a solution which would ensure the sustainability of the grounds and buildings, whilst allowing access to the wider public enabling everyone to use and enjoy this area adjacent to the country park.

The development, if planning permission is granted, will restore the mansion and grounds, provide 263 new homes, as well as new footpaths and cycle routes and other public facilities linking into the main country park.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

An Equalities Impact Assessment was not required.

10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable.

11. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

Not applicable

Background Papers

None