

**UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN ADVISORY
PANEL**
5 JANUARY 2004

Chair: * Councillor Burchell

 Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton
 * Mrs Bath
 * Idaikkadar

 * Mrs Kinnear
 * N Shah
 Anne Whitehead

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS
RECOMMENDATION 1 - Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Major Revisions to Policies and Reasoned Justifications to be included in Proposed Modifications

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer, which highlighted certain issues not covered in the report submitted to the Panel's meeting held on 12 November 2003. The report before the Panel at its meeting held on 5 January 2004 accordingly suggested revised wording of Policies and Reasoned Justifications and for these to be brought forward as Proposed Modifications to the HUDP. Those recommendations listed at paragraph 6 of the officer report were discussed at the meeting and, where appropriate, individual votes were taken. Details of these are set out in Part II of the minutes below (Minute 75 below refers). Following the votes, the majority of the revised wording of Policies and Reasoned Justifications set out in the officer report were agreed and in some cases, amendments made. These are set out below:

SCHEDULE 6 – CAR PARKING STANDARDS

- Section on Car Parking Standards or Non-Residential Development:

It was unanimously agreed that the words 'Maximum of 1 space per 10 bedrooms **with separately designated parking for employees, visitors and customers**' under C2 Hospitals (see table in the report) should not be deleted;

[Note: Cabinet, at its meeting held on 13 January 2004, was asked to add the bold and underlined point above which was inadvertently omitted from the Chief Planning Officer's Report and was inserted after consultation with Councillors Marilyn Ashton and Burchell.]

MAXIMUM RESIDENTIAL OFF-STREET PARKING

- Section on Car Parking Standards for Residential Development (Class C3: Dwelling Houses)

It was agreed that the word 'private' had been erroneously included in the table and should therefore be deleted;

H6: AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND H7: HOUSING FOR KEY WORKERS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET:

- Section on Replacement Affordable Housing Policy H6

That the explanation from the Group Planner as to why the words 'in perpetuity' had not been included be noted and that the following wording be included for approval by Cabinet:

Insert before the final paragraph in the replacement Policy H6 the following wording:-

THE COUNCIL WILL ENSURE, THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING OBLIGATIONS, THAT THE OCCUPATION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS RESTRICTED TO PEOPLE WHO ARE REGARDED BY THE COUNCIL AS IN NEED OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Add at the end of the policy the wording:-

THE REQUIREMENT SET OUT IN THE LAST TWO PARAGRAPHS ABOVE WILL BE DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN MET IF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS TRANSFERRED TO A REGISTERED SOCIAL LANDLORD APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL.

Within the reasoned justification, include the following wording based on paragraphs 6.36 - 6.38 in the draft replacement HUDP, in relation to occupation:-

Government guidance stresses the importance of retaining the affordability of housing units. Therefore the Council will need to be satisfied that the affordable housing will be available for occupation by those defined by the Council as in need of such housing during the lifetime of the property. The Council will seek the involvement of Housing Associations or RSLs in the management of affordable housing and by the use of Planning Obligations will ensure that developers transfer ownership of a proportion of the site or units to these bodies. Such agencies' continuing interest in the property will ensure control over subsequent changes in occupation.

The Council will expect that appropriate housing development proposals should be managed by RSLs. Where this is not the case, the owners/developers are expected to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Council, that the scheme's terms and conditions are at least equal to those administered by the Council or RSLs.

NEW PROPOSAL SITE – BAE SYSTEMS, WARREN LANE, STANMORE

- * Members noted that the site was approximately 35,000 sq m (375,000 sq ft) and that this figure be inserted in the relevant paragraph.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That the revised wording of Policies and Reasoned Justifications set out in the report of the Chief Planning Officer and for these to be brought forward as Proposed Modifications to the Plan be agreed subject to those amendments set out above.

Reason for Decision: To expedite adoption of the replacement Harrow UDP after completion of all statutory procedures.

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear did not support the recommendation in its entirety – Minute No. 75 also refers].

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Draft Proposed Modifications

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That the draft schedule of the Council's Proposed Modifications to the Replacement HUDP be agreed subject to the inclusion of the recommendations set out under UDP Advisory Panel Meeting – Special – held on 12 November 2003 (Minute No. 66 refers) and recommendations 1 (above) and 3 (below) (UDP Advisory Panel Meeting held on 5 January 2004) and for these to be placed on deposit alongside the Statement of Decisions.

Reason for Decision: To expedite adoption of the replacement Harrow UDP after completion of all statutory procedures.

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear did not support the recommendation in its entirety – Minute No. 75 also refers].

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Statement of Decisions on the Inspector's Report on the Public Local Inquiry

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

That the Council's Statement of Decisions on the Recommendations contained in the Inspector's Report be agreed subject to amendment of the comments under the headings 'LBH Response' and 'Reason for Response' on page 146 of the report relating to Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, and the Statement be placed on deposit subject to the inclusion of the recommendations set out under UDP Advisory Panel Meeting – Special – held on 12 November 2003 (Minute No. 66 refers) and recommendations 1 and 2 (above).

Reason for Decision: To expedite adoption of the replacement HUDP after completion of all statutory procedures.

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear did not support the recommendation in its entirety – Minute No. 75 also refers].

PART II - MINUTES68. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

69. **Declarations of Interest:**

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

70. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances / Grounds for Urgency</u>
12. Residents' health fears and masts – query update to Harrow's policies. (Minute 79 refers)	That it had not been possible to include this item on the agenda as the Member concerned was not certain about its despatch date. Additionally, the Member concerned wished to discuss further the response she had received from the Chief Planning Officer concerning a petition in relation to telephone masts and whether a policy could be included in the HUDP or a report submitted to the next UDP Advisory Panel meeting.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

71. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Special meeting held on 12 November 2003, be confirmed as a correct record and that the signing of the minutes be deferred until printed in the next Council Bound Minute Volume (Vol. 7).

72. **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).

73. **Petitions:**

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

74. **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).

75. **Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Major Revisions to Policies and Reasoned Justifications to be included in Proposed Modifications:**
(Recommendation 1 above also refers).

Those recommendations listed at paragraph 6 of the report were discussed at the meeting and, where appropriate, individual votes taken. Following the votes, the majority of the revised wording of Policies and Reasoned Justifications set out in the officer report were agreed and, in some cases, amendments made. These are marked with an asterisk below.

A - POLICY SH1 – HOUSING PROVISION AND HOUSING NEED

- Section on Housing Provision and Housing Need

Note: (1) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the deletion of the words 'The Borough's Residents' and their replacement by 'Prospective Occupants';

(2) It was moved and seconded that under criterion E and paragraph 2.81 the words 'and some low cost market housing as part of a development on a site not suited in particular circumstances for rented provision' be included after 'and shared ownership' accommodation, as suggested in the Inspector's report (page 128, para 6.51).

Following a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted for the motion set out in (2) above.

B - T13 & SCHEDULE 6: PARKING STANDARDS AND T14 AND PARA 5.32: NEW DEVELOPMENT AND ON-STREET PARKING

- Section on Replacement Policy T13

Note: (1) Councillor Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the inclusion of the word 'maximum' in the preamble of Schedule 6 and in the 6th line of paragraph 5.31 of the report;

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the inclusion of 'The reduction in the number of parking spaces is a strong incentive to promoting and seeking alternative modes other than the car' in paragraph 5.32.

C - SCHEDULE 6 – CAR PARKING STANDARDS

- Section on Car Parking Standards or Non-Residential Development:

Note: * (1) It was unanimously agreed that the words 'Maximum of 1 space per 10 bedrooms with separately designated parking for employees, visitors and customers' under C2 Hospitals (see table in the report) should not be deleted; *(the addition of the bold underlined point above, which was inadvertently omitted from the Chief Planning Officer's Report has been inserted after consultation with Councillors Marilyn Ashton and Burchell and Cabinet has been recommended to agree its inclusion).*

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the inclusion of the word 'maximum' throughout the table.

- Section on Exceptional Operational Requirements

Note: (1) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the inclusion of the words 'maximum level' in the 2nd paragraph).

D - MAXIMUM RESIDENTIAL OFF-STREET PARKING

- Section on Car Parking Standards for Residential Development (Class C3: Dwelling Houses)

Note: (1) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the inclusion of the words 'maximum level' as they considered levels of parking as very low;

* (2) it was agreed that the word 'private' had been erroneously included in the table and should therefore be deleted;

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against the deletion of the following last paragraph under this section - 'Conversions will not normally be allowed if the generated car parking/traffic demand cannot be safely accommodated on-site, or on local roads in a manner which leaves 5% residual available kerbside capacity'.

E - H 5: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY

Note: (1) It was moved and seconded that the statement 'The Council will expect that

residential densities in new development should be not less than 150 habitable rooms per hectare' be replaced with 'The Council will expect that residential densities in new development should not be more than 200 habitable rooms per hectare or less than 125 habitable rooms per hectare. Following a vote, this was lost;

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (1) above;

(3) it was moved and seconded that the following last paragraph under this section be deleted:

'With the emphasis in the Plan being placed on a design-led approach to development, it is considered that it is inappropriate to include a maximum density figure'.

Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(4) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (3) above.

F - H6: AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND H7: HOUSING FOR KEY WORKERS AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET:

- Section on Replacement Affordable Housing Policy H6

Note: (1) It was moved and seconded that the words 'which should include key worker accommodation, shared ownership and low cost market housing' should be added after 'full range of affordable housing need' in the last paragraph of the preamble to this section. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (1) above.

(3) It was moved and seconded that the figure of '15' be replaced with '25' in the first paragraph of this section. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(4) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (3) above.

(5) It was moved and seconded that the statement 'The Council considers that the likely minimum percentage of affordable housing to be negotiated on suitable sites should be 30%, set out under criterion B of the policy be deleted and replaced with 'The Council considers that, where appropriate and only on suitable sites, a percentage of 25% affordable housing will be encouraged'. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(6) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (5) above.

(7) It was moved and seconded that an additional criterion (criterion C) be included in the policy as follows: 'The Council will encourage low cost market housing where appropriate'. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(8) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion set out in (7) above.

(9) During discussion on the housing needs of key workers, it was agreed that a copy of a standard Section 106 Agreement be sent to Members of both the Panel and the Development Control Committee and that this should address the concerns about whether property for key workers would remain in perpetuity; the Chair of the UDP Panel be so informed should this not be the case prior to a report being submitted to the Development Control Committee.

(10) In referring to note (9) above, the Chair stated that where there was evidence that a Section 106 Agreement was being flouted, Members should report this to the Chief Planning Officer or the Borough Solicitor for further investigation. The Chair stated that details could be also sent directly to him.

* (11) That the explanation from the Group Planner as to why the words 'in perpetuity' had not been included be noted and that the wording (to be prepared by Officers) be included for approval by Cabinet. This is set out below:

THE COUNCIL WILL ENSURE, THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING OBLIGATIONS, THAT THE OCCUPATION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS RESTRICTED TO PEOPLE WHO ARE REGARDED BY THE COUNCIL AS IN NEED OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

Add at the end of the policy the wording:-

THE REQUIREMENT SET OUT IN THE LAST TWO PARAGRAPHS ABOVE WILL BE DEEMED TO HAVE BEEN MET IF THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS TRANSFERRED TO A REGISTERED SOCIAL LANDLORD APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL.

Within the reasoned justification, include the following wording based on paragraphs 6.36 – 6.38 in the draft replacement HUDP, in relation to occupation:-

Government guidance stresses the importance of retaining the affordability of housing units. Therefore the Council will need to be satisfied that the affordable housing will be available for occupation by those defined by the Council as in need of such housing during the lifetime of the property. The Council will seek the involvement of Housing Associations or RSLs in the management of affordable housing and by the use of Planning Obligations will ensure that developers transfer ownership of a proportion of the site or units to these bodies. Such agencies' continuing interest in the property will ensure control over subsequent changes in occupation.

The Council will expect that appropriate housing development proposals should be managed by RSLs. Where this is not the case, the owners/developers are expected to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Council, that the scheme's terms and conditions are at least equal to those administered by the Council or RSLs.

- Section on Reasoned Justification

(12) It was moved and seconded that the sentence 'It is however important to acknowledge that in Harrow low cost market housing is unlikely to address any housing needs in the Borough, whilst shared ownership is only affordable to a decreasing number of those in need as a result of rising land and property prices' be deleted from paragraph 2. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(13) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion set out in paragraph (12) above.

(14) It was moved and seconded that the paragraph 4 which states 'Reflecting the government's latest thinking and ...' and ends with 'incorporating 15 or more dwellings' be deleted. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(15) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion set out in paragraph (14) above.

(16) That it be noted that a Member urged caution at the use of the words 'cash-in-lieu' in paragraph 6 of this section.

(17) It was moved and seconded that the following second and third sentences of paragraph (9) of this section be deleted: 'On qualifying sites, the Council will normally seek a mix of family and non-family accommodation and a split of 35% : 15% of social rented to intermediate housing, consistent with the scale of identified housing need. This split also reflects the guidance set down in the draft London Plan'. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(18) Councillors Mrs Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion set out in (17) above.

(19) That it be noted that a Member was of the view that a number of paragraphs under this section were over prescriptive, that this may prove to be detrimental and may not achieve the desired agenda. She was of the view that these paragraphs did

not provide a proper mix of housing.

G - AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET

Note (1) It was moved and seconded that the policy 'The Council will aim to secure an average annual affordable housing provision of at least 165 net additional units in the 10 year period from the adoption of the plan' be replaced with 'The Council will encourage an increase in the affordable housing stock by aiming for 165 net additional units in the 10 year period from the adoption of the plan with a particular emphasis on key-worker accommodation in the form of shared-ownership and low-cost market housing where appropriate'. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion set out in paragraph (1) above.

(3) That it be noted that Members of the Conservative Group on the Panel were of the view that they did not agree with the target set out in this policy.

H - H10: CONVERSION OF HOUSES AND OTHER BUILDINGS TO FLATS AND SCHEDULE 8

Note: (1) It was moved and seconded that the following paragraph which had been deleted should be reinstated:

'That Council, however, whilst accepting the need for more conversions, will carefully consider the scale and concentration of conversions in any locality. The need to limit the number of conversions in any area will help to ensure a mixed and balanced community. The Council acknowledges that there are some areas in which the level of conversions historically is already high and it is therefore the Council's intention to continue to encourage a good spread of conversions on individual roads and throughout the Borough rather than a concentration of these on any particular area'.

Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (1) above because they considered the deletion of the statement as a retrograde step.

I - SCHEDULE 8 – WORKING INTERPRETATIONS IN RESPECT OF POLICY H10 CONVERSIONS OF HOUSES AND OTHER BUILDINGS INTO FLATS

Note: (1) It was moved and seconded that none of the text under this section should be deleted. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion in (1) above.

J - NEW PROPOSAL SITE – BAE SYSTEMS, WARREN LANE, STANMORE

Note: * (1) Members noted that the site was approximately 35,000 sq m (375,000 sq ft) and that this figure be inserted in the relevant paragraph.

(2) It was moved and seconded that reference to 'Affordable housing policy would apply. In view of the site's isolated location, public transport services and other measures to improve the site's accessibility for housing will be sought' be deleted as a private vehicle would be required in what was an isolated area. Upon being put to a vote, this was lost; the Chair having exercised his second and casting vote.

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the motion set out in (2) above.

(4) The following comments in relation to (2) above be noted:

- (a) That the BAE systems site should be seen in conjunction with other similar sites such as the RNOH redevelopment, where funding could be secured through Section 106 Agreements which could be used to introduce a permanent bus service;

(b) that other measures in sites of this nature were also being examined, such as the provision of a local/convenient shopping facility.

76. **Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Draft Proposed Modifications:**
(Recommendation 2 above refers).
77. **Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan - Statement of Decisions on the Inspector's Report on the Public Local Inquiry:**
(Recommendation 3 above refers).
78. **Annual Monitoring Report:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer, which provided the Planning Services end of year statement for 2002/03 and a commentary on the statement. In particular the report examined performance against key indicators and targets, the knock-on implications for the Planning Delivery Grant for 2004/05, and the implications regarding the 'naming and shaming' of the Council as a 'planning standards authority'. The report also reviewed workload trends and the implications in all service areas of increasing numbers of applications, legislative changes and regional/sub-regional working.

Members noted that the report before them was for information only and that it had already been considered by the Development Control Committee at its meeting held on 10 December 2003.

During the discussion which followed, a Member stated that it was regrettable that Harrow may not receive the much needed funding which was required to improve its performance. She was concerned that Harrow was not being treated sympathetically by central government. She praised the planning staff for having done an excellent job in the face of difficult circumstances.

The Chair also praised the work done by officers.

A Member stated that unless Harrow improves its performance, the Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) would be lost and that he would not want Harrow to go along the path of being 'named and shamed' as the worst performing local authority.

In response, the Chair suggested that a cross party Member-level meeting ought to be held to identify improvements that could be made when the report from the consultant commissioned by the Council, was available.

A Member stated that Members of the Development Control Committee should not be seen as having acted irresponsibly and that any such implications should be rebutted. She added that Members were responsible to the electorate and had a duty to themselves, the planning team and residents and that it was not necessarily easy to make judgements. She added that dealing with the increase in the number of planning applications for extensions to properties was in itself labour intensive and that the general increase in the number of planning applications received combined with the increase in the number of objections received from local residents had had a knock-on effect on performance as a whole.

A Member stated that the real problem had been with the recruitment/retention of staff over the past few years and that she was amazed that the consultant would be looking into the performance of Members. She added that she was also surprised that the report had even been commissioned.

The Chair responded by saying that Members should not pre-judge the outcome of the report and that they ought to await the findings of the consultant.

In praising the staff in both Forward Planning and Building Control Sections for their dedication and commitment, a Member stated that the Development Control Committee should look at ways in which improvements made could be sustained. He added that Building Control too had experienced problems with recruiting staff and that it was no longer acceptable to say that because of the problems in recruitment/retention of staff, it was not possible to improve performance. He acknowledged that planning applications for larger sites were time consuming but added that special meetings had been held to deal with such applications. He suggested a review of the delegated powers in order to improve the situation.

A Member added that Officers had done an admirable job in the circumstances and that she had no issue with Members being assessed by way of the report being

prepared by the consultant. She pointed out that her Group could not support any further extension of the Chief Planning Officers' delegated powers. She added that only 10-15% of planning applications were submitted to the Development Control Committee for decision with the majority being decided by the planning officers.

Finally, the Chair stated that once the report of the consultant was available, a cross party Member-level informal meeting ought to be held should there be any issues that needed discussing further.

RESOLVED: That the report and the discussion, set out in the preamble above, be noted.

79. **Residents' Health Fears and Masts - Query Update to Harrow's Policies:**
Councillor Kinnear, who had requested for this item to be added to the agenda (Minute No. 70 refers), stated that she was not satisfied that criterion E of policy D26 (on pages 122/123) of the replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan addressed her concerns and requested that a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Panel by the Chief Planning Officer.

In response, the Chief Planning Officer stated that officers in Planning and Legal Services were satisfied that criterion E of policy D26 of the replacement HUDP was adequate and was consistent with the rulings of the Courts. He stressed that health issues were a consideration where the public perception was that health considerations were legitimate reasons for refusing planning applications for telephone masts.

Councillor Kinnear referred to the research carried out on this issue and requested that a review of Harrow's position with a report be submitted to the Panel's next meeting.

The Chair stated that the existing Policy was adequate in dealing with such applications.

RESOLVED: That the discussion, set out in the preamble above, be noted.

80. **Special Meeting of the Unitary Development Plan Advisory Panel:**
Members were advised that a special meeting of the Panel might be necessary should it not be possible for the report setting out objections to the proposed modifications to the HUDP Panel to be submitted to the scheduled meeting on 18 March 2004. The 1 April 2004 was suggested and it was

RESOLVED: That the Committee Administrator be requested to consult Members of the Panel on their availability and confirm the date in writing.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.45 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL
Chair