

181. **Minutes: RESOLVED:** That (1) the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2000, having been circulated, be signed as a correct record;
- (2) the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2000 be deferred until printed in Volume 3 of the Minute Book.
182. **EAST/1058/99 and EAST/1059/99 - RAF Stanmore Park - 411 Dwellings in 2-4 Storey Houses and Flats: Community Facilities; Access; Parking; Public Open Space:**
The Committee considered the above applications.

Application EAST/1058/99/FUL had been deferred from the meeting on 21 June 2000 for additional information and to seek the views of the applicant on a number of issues. The report from the Chief Planning Officer included comments from the applicant where requested by the Committee and addressed the issues raised by the deputations at the meeting on 21 June 2000.

An appeal against the non-determination of application EAST/1059/99 had also been lodged by the applicant on 4 July 2000.

Prior to commencement of discussion on the above applications, it was moved and seconded that any decision on these applications should stand as a recommendation to Full Council to enable all councillors to vote on the application, bearing in mind the significance of the proposed development for the Borough as a whole. Other Members opposed this proposal. It was argued that Full Council was not the appropriate forum to debate planning applications in detail. Moreover, this Committee had the appropriate authority to determine the applications. The restrictions and time limits on debate at full Council were also highlighted. Upon being put to a vote, the motion was not agreed. The Committee then agreed to allow a number of objectors to address the Committee.

A local resident expressed his anger at the proposed development. He considered the development to be too large and likely to increase traffic on the Uxbridge Road and other roads which were already suffering from unacceptable congestion. He also referred to a likely increase in crime in the Stanmore area resulting from the scheme. He called for a vote of no confidence in the Planning Committee.

A procedural motion in accordance with Standing Order 17(g) (viii), that Councillor Shah do leave the meeting, was moved and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, this was not agreed.

The representative from "Harrow in Leaf" referred to a 1938 document from the Air Ministry in which it was stated that half of the Stanmore Park site was to be retained for open space. He also referred to the devastation of the landscaped grounds within Stanmore Park which had taken place prior to World War 2. He was strongly opposed to the proposed development which he saw as a missed opportunity to repair some of the damage previously caused to the site.

The Chairman of the Bentley Way Association recognised that the site was ripe for development. However, he was opposed to the sheer scale of the proposals and the impact this would have on the local community.

The representative of residents in Elliott Road welcomed the fact that consultation had taken place. However, he raised anxieties about the current condition of the boundary fencing on the site. He was concerned that in several places, it was possible for people to access the site through gaps in the fencing. He also queried the vehicular access to the site from Douglas Close.

The representative from Stanmore Planning Advisory Committee (SPAC) thanked both the Developers for being willing to meet the group and also the Council and the Developers for their co-operation in making information available. However, he was opposed to the proposals as he considered the scale and density of the development to be excessive. He was concerned about the loss of the trees on Uxbridge Road. He considered the proportion of social housing to be too high. He was concerned that 30% of the social housing was specified for the use of black and ethnic minorities. He considered this to be positive discrimination to a level of being racist. Other concerns he raised related to the proposed play area and the lack of recreational space for older children and again to traffic congestion in Stanmore which was already at an unacceptable level.

Members raised a number of detailed and specific questions with the various objectors.

Training and Employment

Submit a construction training and recruitment plan, to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development, working in partnership with "Building a Future for North West London (SRB4)", MHT and the Council, with a view to the training and employment of local people on site, and regular monitoring information shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority to ensure the proper implementation of the plan.

Sustainable Development

Build the development in accordance with 'Sustainable Development Objectives for RAF Stanmore'.

(2) A formal decision notice subject to the planning conditions and informatives reported and the following additional conditions and informatives will be issued only upon the completion of the aforementioned legal agreement;

1. Access to and from Douglas Close shall be restricted to pedestrians and cyclists only. REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
2. In addition to the main play area, the applicant shall provide toddlers' play equipment in other areas within the site. Details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. REASON: To ensure satisfactory provision of children's play facilities.

Informative:

The applicant is urged to encourage the formation of a residents' association from the estate to enable smooth and efficient management of the site on an ongoing basis.

(3) in respect of application EAST/1059/99/FUL, the applicant be informed that, had the appeal not been lodged, the application would have been granted planning permission subject to identical legal agreement heads of terms and planning conditions as for application EAST/1058/99/FUL as set out above.

(Notes: (1) At the meeting on 6 September 2000, by virtue of the conduct of some of the public present, despite appeals from the Chair for order, the applicant's representatives were denied the opportunity to respond to all of the points raised by Members);

(2) Councillors Mrs Ashton, Mrs Bath, Lane, Mrs Kinnear and Scowen wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the proposal to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the preamble above, and against the above decision although they were not opposed to the additional conditions proposed by the Labour Group).

183. **EAST/576/00/FUL - Middlesex & Herts Country Club, Old Redding:** The Committee considered the above application for redevelopment with a two storey building to provide 14 flats over basement parking, access and landscaping.

Having considered this application, it was:

RESOLVED: That the applicant be informed, subject to the direction of the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions that:-

1. The proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application, relating to:-

The retention and maintenance of the curtilage of the application site as landscaped amenity grounds to be used only in association with the occupation of the flats hereby approved.

2. The receipt of a contribution of £379,604 to secure the provision and retention of affordable housing in accordance with Policy H9 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan,
2. A formal decision notice, subject to the planning conditions and informatives reported, and the following additional conditions, will be issued only upon completion of the aforementioned legal agreement.

APPENDIX B



APPEND X C

1

