

STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL

14 MARCH 2006

Chair: * Councillor Burchell

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Mrs Kinnear
* Mrs Bath N Shah
* Idaikkadar * Anne Whitehead

Non-voting Councillor Branch
Co-opted Member:

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Responses to the Statutory Consultation on the Draft Access for All Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and its Accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Approval for Adoption**

The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living), which outlined how the responses to the statutory consultation that had taken place during November and December 2005 had been incorporated into the SPD and SA. The final versions of the SPD and SA had been circulated with the agenda, and the Panel was asked to consider whether to recommend these documents to the Portfolio Holder for adoption.

The Panel agreed the proposed changes to the draft SPD and its accompanying SA and

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing)

That (1) the SPD and its accompanying SA be cleared and agreed;

(2) the SPD and its accompanying SA be adopted.

[REASON: To ensure that access considerations form an integral part of the development process and that local services and facilities are accessible to everyone].

(See also Minute 96).

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Draft Accessible Homes Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) - Consideration of Responses to the Statutory Consultation

The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living) which outlined how the responses to the statutory consultation that had taken place during December 2005 had been incorporated into the SPD and SA. The final versions of the SPD and SA had been circulated with the agenda, and the Panel was asked to consider whether to recommend these documents to the Portfolio Holder for adoption.

Officers advised that, since the agenda had been circulated, it had been proposed that further amendments be made to the SPD and SA. A summary of the proposed amendments and a revised version of the documents incorporating the changes was tabled at the meeting.

During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:

- Once adopted, the SPD would most likely be sent to developers in CD format, as the document would be costly to print. Development Control officers would be made aware of the content so that they could advise developers accordingly.
- The Panel agreed that it would be useful for training on the document to be built into the Member Training process.

The Panel agreed the proposed changes to the draft SPD and its accompanying SA and

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing)

That (1) the SPD and its accompanying SA be cleared and agreed;

(2) the SPD and its accompanying SA be adopted.

[REASON: To ensure that new residential developments, including conversions and extensions, are of good quality in order to maintain and enhance the residential component and character of the Borough, and to provide and retain a good range of housing types and sizes, of a high standard and design, to meet the varied physical and economic needs of the Borough's residents].

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Rayners Lane Conservation Area

The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living), which included a draft of the Rayners Lane Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which had been revised following public consultation. Officers had recommended that the revised draft be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for formal adoption.

A document detailing changes that had been made to the document since the agenda had been printed and circulated was tabled.

A Member expressed concern that the Conservation Area Appraisal contained a number of subjective statements such as "startlingly cheap" (page 299 of the agenda). The Panel agreed that the tone of the document should be objective.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing)

That the revised draft, amended in accordance with the comments made by the Panel, be formally adopted.

[REASON: To enable to Council to work towards its statutory requirements and towards improving its performance against BVPI 219 on conservation areas].

(See also Minute 99).

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Old Church Lane Conservation Area

The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living), which included a draft of the Old Church Lane Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which had been revised following public consultation. Officers had recommended that the revised draft be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for formal adoption.

A document detailing changes that had been made to the document since the agenda had been printed and circulated was tabled. Officers advised that these were mainly historical and factual corrections that had been made as a result of consultation responses received.

A Member commented that the sentence beginning "Drawing the area together..." (page 346 of the agenda) could be reworded to make the meaning clearer.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing)

That the revised draft, amended in accordance with the comments made by the Panel, be formally adopted.

[REASON: To enable to Council to work towards its statutory requirements and towards improving its performance against BVPI 219 on conservation areas].

RECOMMENDATION 5 - Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Edgware High Street Conservation Area

The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living) which contained the first draft of the Edgware High Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy. Officers had recommended that the draft go forward for public consultation.

An additional map of the area was tabled at the meeting.

During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:

- Officers confirmed that Members of the Panel and Ward Councillors would be advised of the date of the consultation meeting.
- The Panel agreed that one of the main issues in relation to this conservation area was its location adjacent to another borough, which meant that development in the locality was not within Harrow's control. Members were pleased that the report highlighted the importance of making links with the London Borough of Barnet.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Housing)

That the draft be approved for public consultation.

[REASON: To enable to Council to work towards its statutory requirements and towards improving its performance against BVPI 219 on conservation areas].

PART II - MINUTES

89. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

90. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note the following declarations of interest made by Members present relating to business to be transacted at this meeting:

- (i) Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest arising from the fact that she was a Local Authority appointee to the Harrow Weald Common Board of Conservators. Accordingly, she would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making.
- (ii) Councillor Anne Whitehead declared a personal interest arising from the fact that she was a Local Authority appointee to the Harrow Weald Common Board of Conservators. Accordingly, she would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making.

91. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) agenda items 10 and 15 be taken before agenda item 8;

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

92. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 1 December 2005 and of the Special meeting on 4 January 2006, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as correct records;

(2) the Chair be given authority to sign the minutes of the Special meeting held on 14 February 2006, those minutes having been circulated, as a correct record, once printed in the Council Bound Minute Volume.

93. **Public Questions:**

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

94. **Petitions:**

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

95. **Deputations:**
Having been informed that a late request had been received for a deputation, the Panel
- RESOLVED:** To suspend Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4E of the Constitution) in order to receive a deputation from Mr Jack Pine in relation to agenda item 15 – Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Grimsdyke Estate and Brookshill Drive Conservation Area.
96. **Responses to the Statutory Consultation on the Draft Access for All Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and its Accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Approval for Adoption:**
Further to Recommendation 1 above, the Panel unanimously commended and thanked officers for an accessible and informative report.
- RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.
97. **Draft Accessible Homes Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) - Consideration of Responses to the Statutory Consultation:**
(See Recommendation 2 above).
98. **Harrow Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document and Accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report - Progress Report:**
The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living), which detailed progress made on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report, and outlined ideas for the development of the Harrow Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Officers emphasised that the SA and SPD circulated with the agenda were working drafts and, as such, contained incomplete sections, such as the statistical items on page 264 of the agenda.
- During the discussion on the report, the following issues were raised:
- Referring to the Panel's decision at its meeting held on 1 December 2005 to recommend to Cabinet that a single, overarching SPD covering all Harrow's conservation areas be produced, a Member, who had voted against the Panel's decision, reiterated the view that she did not support the single SPD approach.
 - In response to a question from a Member regarding the opportunity that would be afforded to Members of the Panel and Ward Councillors to comment on the content of the SA and SPD, the Chair requested that Members of the Panel liaise with officers outside of the meeting if they wished to make detailed comments on the content. Officers confirmed that Ward Councillors would be consulted on the content of the SA and SPD.
- RESOLVED:** That the working drafts of the SA and SPD be noted.
99. **Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Rayners Lane Conservation Area:**
Further to Recommendation 3 above, which recommended to the Portfolio Holder that the revised draft be formally adopted, some Members noted that the former cinema was described as "in need of substantial repair" (page 303 of the agenda).
- RESOLVED:** That officers be requested to investigate whether the building was supposed to be maintained under the terms of a Section 106 Agreement.
100. **Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Harrow School Conservation Area:**
The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living), which included a draft of the Harrow School Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which had been revised following public consultation. Officers had recommended that the revised draft be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for formal adoption.
- A document detailing changes that had been made to the document since the agenda had been printed and circulated was tabled. Some Members expressed concern that there appeared to have been a large number of changes made, and stated that it would not be possible for Members to read the revisions at the meeting, in order to make an informed decision. Members were of the view that they would wish to read the revised documents outside of the meeting, and inform officers of any comments they wished to make on the content.

A Member stated that, in her view, the five days' notice which had been given for the public consultation meeting was inadequate, and this was reflected in the fact that the meeting had only been attended by approximately fifteen people. The Member also felt that the consultation had not extended far enough. In response to the Member's suggestion that it might be beneficial to undertake a further period of consultation, the Chair confirmed that a revised report would need to be resubmitted to the Panel before a decision on further consultation could be made.

RESOLVED: That (1) the recommendation of the Executive Director (Urban Living) be not agreed; and

(2) officers be requested to revisit the document in light of Members' comments and resubmit it to the Panel for consideration.

101. **Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Old Church Lane Conservation Area:**

(See Recommendation 4 above).

102. **Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Edgware High Street Conservation Area:**

(See Recommendation 5 above).

103. **Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Grimsdyke Estate and Brookshill Drive Conservation Area:**

The Panel received a report of the Executive Director (Urban Living), which contained the first draft of the Grimsdyke Estate and Brookshill Drive Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy. Officers had recommended that the draft go forward for public consultation.

The Panel also heard a deputation on this matter.

A number of additional maps of the area were tabled at the meeting, and Members requested that these be annotated with building names, and enlarged to a whole page, before being distributed as part of the consultation. Officers advised that page 396 of the agenda contained an error: the heading "Management Plan" should read "Summary of the Key Problems and Pressures".

During discussion on the report, Members expressed concern regarding references in the report to the use of redundant agricultural buildings, particularly in relation to housing development. Members cited the sentence beginning "Should the search..." in relation to 'Redundant agricultural buildings' (page 398 of the agenda), and the two sentences beginning "Every agricultural/rural option..." in relation to 'Pressure from new development/demolition and residential use' (page 399 of the agenda) as examples of references that should be deleted. A Member cautioned against imposing a total restriction on the development of redundant agricultural buildings as to do so could prevent the buildings from being used for a purpose that might assist agricultural use.

RESOLVED: That (1) the recommendation of the Executive Director (Urban Living) be not agreed;

(2) officers be requested to revisit the document in light of Members' comments and those of the depute, and resubmit it to the Panel for consideration.

(See also Minute 95).

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

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL
Chair