

**UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN ADVISORY
PANEL (SPECIAL)**

12 NOVEMBER 2003

Chair: * Councillor Burchell

Councillors:	* Marilyn Ashton	* Kara (1)
	* Mrs Bath	* N Shah
	* Idaikkadar	* Anne Whitehead

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

58. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Mrs Kinnear	Councillor Kara

59. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business to be transacted at this meeting.

60. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items be considered with the press and public present.

61. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

62. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

63. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no petitions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 13 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

64. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no deputations to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

65. **References from Council and Other Committees/Panels:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no references to be received from Council or other Committees/Panels.

66. **Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Consideration of the Inspector's Report on the Public Local Inquiry:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which considered the recommendations of the Inspector on the Public Local Inquiry relating to the replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP). The report accordingly suggested a response to each of the Inspector's recommendations and a reason for each response. Those recommendations listed at paragraph 6 of the report and marked with an asterisk, it was advised, had been identified as requiring more detailed consideration and officers therefore proposed that they should be the subject of further reports to the Panel in due course.

It was noted that officers were recommending that the overwhelming majority of the

Inspector's recommendations be accepted and that only a small number not be accepted, either in full or in part.

The Panel were invited to consider and discuss the officer comments so far. When the Panel had agreed a complete response this would be the subject of a recommendation to Cabinet and, subject to their input, a statement of decisions would then be published, alongside the proposed modifications to the Plan that would consequently be required, and would be placed on deposit.

Officers further explained that the HUDP needed to be in general conformity with the London Plan, but due to the slippage of the programme for adopting the London Plan, it was proving difficult to progress this. Officers had scheduled a meeting with Greater London Authority officers to discuss the issue further.

During the discussion which followed, Members raised a number of general questions regarding the process of amending the HUDP, including, inter alia, what weight the Inspector's report should be accorded by Members when determining planning applications between now and the adoption of the Replacement HUDP. In response, officers advised that the report would clearly constitute a material consideration in this interim period.

The Panel then turned to discussion of the proposed responses to the Inspector's recommendations. The majority of the responses proposed by officers were approved by the general assent of the Panel, but, at the request of a Member, individual votes were taken on the responses proposed in relation to the following policies on which there was not unanimous support. Following the votes, the officer response to each was agreed as set out in the appendix to the officer report:

- Policy D5 and paragraphs 4.33 and 4.37: New Residential Development – Amenity Space and Privacy; Policy D10: Rear Garden Interface
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policies D13 and D14: Locally Listed Buildings
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Transport Objectives – paragraph 5.12
[Notes: (1) Councillors Burchell, Idaikkadar, N Shah and Anne Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the officer response;
(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policy H5: Residential Density
A Member expressed concern at the Inspector's recommendation that the maximum standard in relation to this policy be deleted. In response it was explained that this was in line with Government policy and that it was considered that the density of development could be more effectively controlled through design factors rather than the relatively crude tool of a maximum density standard.
[Notes: (1) Councillors Burchell, Idaikkadar, N Shah and Anne Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the officer response;
(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policy H10 and paragraph 6.57: Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policy H13: Houses in Multiple Occupation
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policy H16: Hostels
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policy EM14: Business Use – Designated Area: BAE Systems site
[Notes: (1) Councillors Burchell, Idaikkadar, N Shah and Anne Whitehead wished

to be recorded as having voted in favour of the officer response;

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].

- Policy EM17: Change of Use of Shops – Primary Shopping Frontages
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policies EM 18 and EM19: Change of Use of Shops – Secondary Shopping Frontages and Local Centres
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Policy C11: New Education Facilities
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- PS 17: Former Harrow Hospital, and nurses hostel, Roxeth Hill
A Member explained that whilst she did not disagree with the Inspector's recommendation in its entirety, she objected to the inclusion of the words 'high density' in the amendment.

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].
- Site of Nature Conservation Importance: Wood Farm (and PIC33)
[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kara wished to be recorded as having voted against the approval of the officer response].

The following issues, inter alia, were also raised and discussed:

- Policies T17, T18 and H4
Some concern was expressed at the Inspector's recommendation that policies T17, T18 and H4 be deleted, however officers explained that the Inspector proposed the deletion of these on the basis that they were unnecessary and reassured the Panel that the aim of each was still covered by other policies in the Plan.
- Policy R14 and paragraphs 8.49 and 8.50: Libraries
Some disagreement was expressed at the Inspector's recommendation that policy R14 be deleted. Officers explained that as the policy constituted a statement of intent it was not suitable for inclusion in the HUDP, but would probably be suitable for inclusion in the local development framework which the Authority would be required to develop.
- Policy T15: Making Better Use of Parking Provision
It was noted that the Inspector proposed the deletion of policy T15. Several Members expressed concern at this and, following discussion, it was agreed that, as T15 was closely related to policies T13 and T14, which were to be combined and re-drafted and the subject of a further report to the Panel, the response to T15 would be further considered at this stage.
- Policy SD1: Quality of Design
It was noted that officers were recommending that the Inspector's recommendation in respect of this policy be not accepted in full and proposed an alternative form of amended wording. It was agreed that the wording be given further consideration and the subject of a further report to the Panel.

RESOLVED: That (1) the officer response to policy SD1 be the subject of a further report to be submitted to the Panel;

(2) the Panel reserve its approval of the officer response to policy T15 pending the submission of a further report regarding policies T13 and T14 to a future meeting of the Panel; and

(3) it be agreed to recommend to the Cabinet the responses to the recommendations contained in the Inspector's report now approved at this Panel meeting, excepting those items which it has been agreed above and in the officer report are to be the subject of a further report to the Panel (see note below).

[Note: The Council's Statement of Decisions on the recommendations contained in the Inspector's report will be the subject of a composite recommendation to Cabinet

in due course when the Panel have responded to the remainder of the recommendations and considered all the modifications to the Plan resulting from consideration of the Inspector's recommendations].

67. **Any Other Business:**

- Cancellation of the Special Meeting scheduled to take place on 18 November 2003
It was noted the Panel had also made provision for a further Special Meeting to be held on 18 November in case further discussion of the recommendations of the Inspector was required. It was now agreed that this meeting would be cancelled as it was no longer required.

RESOLVED: That the Special Meeting of the Panel scheduled for 18 November 2003 be cancelled.

- The reform of the development plan system
Further to the previous discussions regarding the reform of the development plan system, the Chair requested that officers circulate to Members of the Panel publications which had recently been received regarding the reforms. He also requested that officers organise a training session for Members regarding the changes.

RESOLVED: That the documents referred to above be circulated to all Members of the Panel and officers organise training for Members regarding the reform of the development plan system.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.59 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL
Chair