

**UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN ADVISORY  
PANEL (SPECIAL)****7 JUNE 2004**

Chair: \* Councillor Burchell

Councillors: \* Marilyn Ashton  
\* Mrs Bath  
\* Bluston (2)\* Idaikkadar  
\* Mrs Kinnear  
\* Anne Whitehead\* Denotes Member present  
(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillor David Ashton also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minute 95 below].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP) - Consideration of representations on the Proposed Modifications and Adoption of Plan**

Your Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which outlined representations received in response to the Council's publication of the post-inquiry proposed modifications to the revised deposit draft Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP), and, accordingly, set out suggested responses to those representations.

The report concluded that no new issues were raised by any of the objections received and that, further to previous reports received by the Panel, negotiations had been held with the Mayor for London and the Government Office for London, and having had regard to the guidance of the Secretary of State of 19 April 2004, the Council's view was that the Replacement HUDP was in general conformity with the London Plan. Therefore, the report recommended that the Council now proceed to adopt the Replacement HUDP without further modifications.

It was noted that, arising from the discussions with the Mayor, the Council had undertaken to prioritise the review of the Council's waste and housing policies under the Local Development Framework.

Prior to discussing the report, your Panel received a deputation from a local resident. The resident expressed concern at the adoption of the Replacement HUDP insofar as it related to the BAE Systems, Limes House and Wood Farm sites.

In expanding upon her concerns, the depute advised that she objected to the designation of the BAE Systems site as suitable for housing, as she felt this use would be detrimental to the green belt and nature conservation, and indicated that, contrary to the evidence presented to the inquiry, in her view there was still a demand for the employment use of the site. She considered that the ecological survey of the site had been inadequate and its nature conservation value had therefore not been recognised. She advised that BAE had refused an entomologist - hired by local residents - access to most areas of the site. She indicated that she did not accept the Council's response to her objection, which was that existing policies already provided adequate protection for the green belt and due consideration would be given to issues such as the impact of a development on the green belt at the planning application stage.

The depute further referred to similar concerns relating to the Limes House and Wood Farm sites. She considered that the Council should have accepted the inspector's recommendation in relation to the Limes House site and argued that the Wood Farm site provided a 'green corridor' which was essential for the survival of other adjacent sites.

In concluding her deputation, the depute advised of the collection of a petition with approximately 7000 signatures which called upon the Council to protect the green belt.

Following the receipt of the deputation, the Chief Planning Officer spoke to the officer report. He emphasised that, if further modifications to the Replacement HUDP were agreed at this late stage, it would be necessary to place the Plan back on deposit for the required period, and, depending on the extent of the modifications, it might prove necessary to re-open the public inquiry into the Plan. This, it was noted, would cause significant further delays to adoption.

It was also explained that, if resources continued to be diverted to deal with matters relating to the Replacement HUDP, it would not prove possible to progress the preparation of the draft Local Development Framework (LDF), as required under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, and would place the Authority at risk of not meeting the related government deadlines.

Members were further reminded that the Authority would also have to continue to rely on the previously adopted UDP (1994), which was now out of date, at appeals, and, in considering planning applications, the London Plan and other government guidance would take precedence in the absence of an adopted UDP.

Officers also advised of a minor amendment to the fourth officer recommendation; it was proposed that the words 'subject to publication of the relevant statutory notices' be inserted for the purposes of clarification of the adoption process.

Following the presentation, Members sought clarification on a number of issues and turned to discussion of the report. The following points, inter alia, were raised and discussed:

- Review of the green belt policy  
A Member inquired whether concerns raised by the deputees in relation to safeguarding the green belt might be addressed by prioritising the review of the green belt policy following the adoption of the HUDP. In response, the Chair advised that a report on the green belt strategy was scheduled to be submitted to the July meeting of Cabinet and could be admitted to the agenda for the Panel's July meeting to allow its comments to inform Cabinet's decision. It was agreed that the Panel would welcome the opportunity to comment on the strategy.
- Objections to the Proposed Modifications  
A Member advised that, whilst she recognised that delaying adoption of the Plan further would cause serious difficulties, she shared many of the concerns expressed by local residents and associations in relation to the proposed modifications to the HUDP, including those raised by the House Builders' Federation and the Pinner Association. In particular she highlighted her concern in relation to the Council's affordable housing policy; she considered that affordable housing should include low cost market housing and not just shared ownership housing.
- Policies relating to Telecommunications Masts  
A Member requested that as part of the work to progress the development of the LDS, officers urgently review the Council's policy in relation to Telecommunications Masts to ensure that it was sufficiently robust and included within it reference to the ICNRIP guidelines.
- Ecological Surveys  
In response to a query raised by a Member, the Chief Planning Officer assured the Panel that ecological surveys were required to be carried out as a matter of course when applications were submitted in respect of sites situated in the green belt, and the Council as Local Planning Authority was stringent in enforcing this requirement. In response to a further query, it was confirmed that the surveys, although independent, were commissioned by the applicant and emphasised that it was not possible to exclude the applicant from the process without the Authority assuming responsibility for the cost.
- Ecological Surveys of the Borough by the GLA  
In response to a question from a Member, officers confirmed that the GLA body which was the successor of the London Ecology Unit had recently re-surveyed sites of ecological significance in the Borough, and were due to put their findings out to public consultation shortly. It was requested that a copy of their findings be submitted to Panel once available. This was agreed.
- Protection for Locally Listed Buildings  
A Member reminded the Panel that, following the recent destruction of part of the Railway Hotel in Hatch End, the Council at its meeting on 29 April had passed a Motion which stated that the Planning Department would be encouraged and supported to liaise with other Boroughs in promoting changes in legislation to strengthen the rules relating to consent required for the demolition of Locally Listed Buildings. The Member queried whether local policies could be also be reviewed to strengthen the Council's position. In response, the Chair advised that the Authority did not have the means to afford further protection to Locally Listed Buildings but reiterated the Council's commitment to lobbying central government

in relation to this issue.

Following the discussion it was

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To Cabinet) That

- (1) the suggested Council responses to the representations made on the Proposed Modifications to the Replacement HUDP be agreed;
- (2) it be agreed that no further modifications to the Replacement HUDP are required;
- (3) it be agreed that it is the Council's opinion that the Replacement HUDP is in general conformity with the London Plan; and
- (4) subject to the publication of the relevant statutory notices, it be agreed that the Council now proceeds to adopt the Replacement HUDP.

[REASON: To expedite adoption of the Replacement HUDP after completion of all statutory procedures].

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Mrs Kinnear wished to be recorded as having voted against resolutions (1), (2) and (4) listed above].

**RECOMMENDATION 2 - Land at Honeypot Lane, Stanmore: Draft Development Brief**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer (CPO) and the draft Development Brief for the above site appended thereto. It was noted that part of the site had been identified in the revised deposit Unitary Development Plan as Proposal Site 33. The Brief set out a series of planning and development parameters to guide the comprehensive development of the site for a mix of uses, including residential and employment generation. Approval of the draft for the purposes of public consultation was sought.

During the ensuing discussion, a Member suggested that, given the sensitivity of this site, the Panel refer the matter to Cabinet for a decision rather than to the relevant Portfolio Holder. In response, officers explained that the results of the consultation would be referred to a future meeting of the Panel and the adoption of the Brief as Supplementary Planning Guidance would then be the subject of a recommendation to Cabinet. The Chair advised that he did not consider that it was necessary to refer the matter to Cabinet at this stage and pointed out that, moreover, applications in respect of this site were expected to be submitted shortly and it was therefore important that the approval of the Development Brief be progressed as soon as possible to allow it to guide development of the site and that any unnecessary delay be avoided.

During further discussion, Members sought clarification on a number of issues from officers. A Member queried what percentages of housing use and of employment use the Council would wish to see on the site. In response, the Chief Planning Officer explained that the Brief was not prescriptive about the percentage of each use as officers wished to retain flexibility to allow for a variety of packages with a corresponding variety of benefits. The CPO agreed, however, that a scheme for the site should make an employment contribution to the Borough and that a scheme which proposed solely housing use would not be acceptable. A Member suggested that the Brief be amended to make this explicitly clear. It was agreed that the following be inserted as a fourth bullet point under Section 2: Purpose of the Brief: 'As a strategic employment site a scheme for this site should make a significant employment contribution to the Borough'.

Several Members also commented that the Brief would benefit from the inclusion of a glossary to explain the meaning of some terms – for example 'intermediate housing' - to make the brief more accessible to ordinary members of the public.

Finally, a Member pointed out that the use of this site would impact on several nearby Wards, not just Canons Ward, and therefore requested that future reports relating to this matter also be distributed to Belmont and Queensbury Ward Members.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (To the Portfolio Holder)

That the draft Development Brief for land at Honeypot Lane, Stanmore be approved, as set out in the officer report, for the purposes of public consultation.

[REASON: As set out in the officer report].

**PART II - MINUTES**

93. **Appointment of Chair:**

**RESOLVED:** That the appointment of Councillor Burchell as the Chair of the Unitary Development Plan Advisory Panel for the 2004/2005 Municipal Year, as agreed at the Cabinet Meeting of 20 May 2004, be noted.

94. **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 N Shah	Councillor Bluston

95. **Right of Members to Speak:**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with Advisory Panel Procedure Rule 4.1 Councillor David Ashton, who is not a Member of the Panel, be allowed to speak on agenda items 11 and 12, which related to Honeypot Lane and the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital respectively.

96. **Declarations of Interest:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of personal or prejudicial interests made by Members present arising from the business transacted at this meeting.

97. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**

Councillor Anne Whitehead was nominated and duly seconded for the position of Vice-Chair. It was noted that this was the only valid nomination received, and following a vote, it was

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Anne Whitehead as Vice-Chair of the Unitary Development Plan Advisory Panel for the 2004/2005 Municipal Year.

98. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

**RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items 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>
Item 11 – Honeypot Lane, Stanmore: Draft Development Brief	This report is admitted to the agenda as planning and development guidance for this site is required to enable the Council to respond effectively to anticipated proposals for the development of the site.
Item 12 – Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital Masterplan	This report is admitted to the agenda to enable urgent work on the development of the Masterplan and subsequent planning applications to continue.

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

99. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That the approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2004 be deferred until the next ordinary meeting of this Panel.

100. **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).

101. **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).

102. **Late Deputation Request:**

The Panel considered whether to hear a deputation request which had not been received within the deadline set out under Advisory Panel Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution). In accordance with the provisions of that rule, it was agreed that this requirement be waived on the grounds of urgency and it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the following request be heard:

Deputation re the Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan – Consideration of Representations on the Proposed Modifications and Adoption of Plan: From Mrs Lis, a local resident.

(See also Recommendation 1).

103. **Replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP) - Consideration of representations on the Proposed Modifications and Adoption of Plan:**

Further to Recommendation 1, above, it was

**RESOLVED:** That (1) a report regarding the green belt strategy be submitted to the Panel's next meeting for comment; and

(2) the results of the GLA's ecological surveys of the Borough be submitted to the Panel when available.

[REASON: To ensure that open spaces/sites of significant ecological value in the Borough are afforded adequate protection].

104. **Land at Honeypot Lane, Stanmore: Draft Development Brief:**

Recommendation 2, above, refers.

105. **Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital Masterplan:**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and a copy of the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital Masterplan and Statement, which was circulated separately. It was explained that planning applications in relation to this site were expected to be submitted in the near future and the Masterplan was intended to set those applications within an overall context. Members were invited to comment on the Masterplan to assist in its development and to inform any future planning applications. It was noted that public consultation on the document was also ongoing.

During the debate which followed, a Member queried the status of the Masterplan and stressed her concern that those Members who were also Members of the Development Control Committee should not prejudice their eventual consideration of the applications relating to this site. In response, the Chief Planning Officer emphasised that the Panel's comments and the Masterplan would not be binding on Members of the Development Control Committee and assured Members that it would not prejudice the Committee's consideration of future applications.

Several Members registered their concern that the site would be developed in a piecemeal fashion and that the development of the more profitable elements of the site would be progressed at a faster rate and at the expense of the development of the new medical facilities and the enhancement of the landscaping and open spaces. The Chief Planning Officer agreed that this was a valid concern and advised that this could be addressed by the use of conditions at the planning application stage.

Several Members also voiced concern that the development, together with other significant developments in neighbouring Barnet, would give rise to increased traffic on Wood Lane and Warren Lane, which, they explained were currently relatively quiet, tree lined, unlit and attractive roads. They emphasised that they would wish the atmosphere and character of these roads to be retained. A backbenching Member who had been given permission by the Panel to speak in relation to this item suggested that, whilst he recognised it would be a costly exercise, the possibility of constructing a new road around the edges of the site to relieve the pressure of traffic on roads such as Wood Lane and Warren Lane be investigated. The Chair advised that he would be hesitant to support the construction of a new road in the green belt and also expressed

doubt as to the viability of the suggestion. It was noted that other possibilities to reduce congestion were also being explored, such as the re-routing of buses to ensure that a service stopped directly outside the hospital.

Other concerns expressed included that some of the key worker housing on the site be restricted in perpetuity to those who also worked on site and that the density of the schemes proposed be appropriate to a site located in such a sensitive location.

**RESOLVED:** That the Panel's comments on the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital Masterplan and Statement be noted, as set out above.

[REASON: To inform further development of the Masterplan and subsequent planning applications].

106. **Item Placed on the Agenda Further to a Request made by a Member - Section 106**

**Agreements:**

Councillor Mrs Kinnear had requested that an item regarding Section 106 Agreements be admitted to the agenda under the provisions of Panel Procedure Rule 6(ii) (Part 4E of the Constitution) to allow urgent discussion of this issue.

Following discussion it was

**RESOLVED:** That an item regarding Section 106 Agreements be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the Panel to allow discussion at that meeting.

107. **Any Other Business:**

The Chief Planning Officer distributed a letter from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister regarding the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act to the Members present for their information.

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

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.58 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL  
Chair