

**UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN ADVISORY  
PANEL****16 SEPTEMBER 2003**

Chair: \* Councillor Burchell

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

\* Denotes Member present

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Employment Land Study by Chesterton and Future  
Employment Policy in the Local Development Framework**

Your Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer which summarised the findings of Chesterton plc, external consultants commissioned by the Council, to produce a study on the supply and demand for employment land and premises in the Borough. Their remit covered the following:

- assessing overall quantitative and qualitative demand for industrial land and office floorspace
- the demand for low-rent accommodation for business start-ups and the demand for work/live units
- assessment of the major industrial sites of the Borough in terms of their marketability and the future viability and attractiveness of the office centres of Harrow and South Harrow.

Chesterton plc's findings considered by your Panel are set out in the officer's report circulated in the Supporting Documents pack. In noting these findings, your Panel was informed that Chesterton plc had conducted their study before the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Public Inquiry and therefore Chesterton plc's findings, while helpful to the Public Inquiry, are now not all relevant as a result of the Inspector's Report.

Your Panel also agreed to the preparation of Master Plans/Area Action Plans for a number of sites in the area and further agreed that such plans ought to be also produced for both the Honeypt Lane area and the Biro Works site.

Members of the Panel made the following observations:

- that the fact that Chesterton plc agreed with Harrow that the BAE Systems site should be earmarked for B1 Use be welcomed, although the UDP Inspector disagreed with this
- that, whilst the findings showed that the current office accommodation in South Harrow is unlikely to be let in the near future, should the Master Plan for this area put forward a case for anything other than residential use, the issue of additional parking provision would need to be addressed
- that, whilst the bus service in South Harrow had improved, public transport, in particular the rail service into London, was inadequate.
- that access by vehicles to the Borough was limited and that the UDP Inspector had commented on this
- that there was a growth in demand for small industrial premises
- that the demand for inward investment was limited
- that the take-up of offices in the town centre was low.

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

(1) That the findings of the Employment Land Study prepared for the Council by Chesterton plc, especially the strong message that there is a need to continue to protect land and premises in employment use, given the frustrated demand in the

Borough, be noted;

(2) that Master Plans/Area Action Plans for the Northolt Road, South Harrow Business Use Area/the western part of Wealdstone Industrial & Business Use Area, the Honeypot Lane area and the Biro Works site be prepared;

(3) that the changes to the nature of employment policy that will need to be considered as part of the process of moving towards the Local Development Framework be noted.

[REASON: To support employment land policies in the Harrow UDP and give direction to further policy development and site specific work.]

**RECOMMENDATION 2 - Stanmore Hill Conservation Area - Conservation Area Policy Statement**

At its meeting held on 29 May 2002, Cabinet approved the draft conservation area policy statement for Stanmore Hill. Since then, it has been the subject of public consultations in the Stanmore Hill area and with local and national amenity societies.

Following the completion of these consultations, your Panel received a further report of the Chief Planning Officer on the policy statement for Stanmore Hill Conservation Area. Subject to your approval, the report, which includes detailed changes, will have the status of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP). It is important that it is agreed as SPG because it then has more weight attached to it during the planning process. It will also stand alongside the HUDP with policies stemming from it but with a site specific emphasis.

In welcoming the report, your Panel noted that the final sentence in paragraph 9.2.7 of the Policy Statement had been erroneously deleted. Your Panel was pleased to see that an exercise was being conducted by officers which examined each of the conservation areas systematically and in detail.

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

That the Conservation Area Policy Statement for Stanmore Hill Conservation Area be approved subject to the inclusion of the following sentence in paragraph 9.2.7 of the Policy Statement:

‘The cattle trough shown on the front cover of this document was relocated some time ago to the open space outside St John’s Church’.

[REASON: To ensure that the Study, which as a draft was subject to public consultation in accordance with Government Guidance, now acquires the status of Supplementary Planning Guidance.]

**RECOMMENDATION 3 - Little Common Conservation Area - Conservation Area Policy Statement**

Cabinet, at its meeting on 29 May 2002, agreed the draft policy statement for the Little Common Conservation Area. Since then, the policy statement has been the subject of public consultation in the area and with the local and national amenity societies.

Public consultation has now been completed and the responses are set out in the officer’s report circulated with the Supporting Documents pack. Your Panel is recommending that the policy statement be approved as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP) so that it carries more weight during the planning process. Your Panel is also recommending that the conservation area boundary be amended and that the revised Article 4 Directions be served again because No.153 Stanmore Hill had been included in the Article 4 Directions and maps, in error and, as a result, the Directions have not been confirmed.

In welcoming the final policy statement, your Panel was pleased to see that an exercise was being conducted by officers which examined each of the conservation areas systematically and in detail.

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

(1) That the Conservation Area Policy Statement for Little Common Conservation Area be approved;

[REASON: To ensure that the Study, which as a draft was subject to public

consultation, now acquires the status of Supplementary Planning Guidance.]

(2) That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to serve again revised Article 4 Directions and amend the Conservation Area boundary to remove one property (No. 153 Stanmore Hill), included in error, as set out in the map on Appendix 2 and the schedules in Appendix 3.

[REASON: To ensure that the appropriate notices are served.]

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4 - London Plan EIP Panel Report and the main implications for Harrow**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer on the Examination In Public (EIP) Panel's response to the concerns expressed by the Council over the draft London Plan.

The Panel noted that the EIP Panel had now submitted its report on the London Plan to the Mayor for London for his consideration.

It was explained that the Mayor, in considering the EIP Report, would decide on whether or not to include any of the amendments made by the EIP Panel to the London Plan and, subject to any direction by the Secretary of State, publish the final London Plan. It was expected that he would move quickly towards adoption of the Plan and include the report of the EIP Panel.

It was pointed out that there was no further role for the Boroughs for involvement and that the Mayor for London's decision would be final. Additionally, the Government Office for London (GOL) could only reject the London Plan if correct procedures had not been followed or that the Plan was contrary to the guidance issued by Central Government.

Members were also informed that once the London Plan had been approved, all London local authorities' Unitary Development Plans (UDPs) would have to be in general conformity to the Mayor's Plan, otherwise they could not be adopted.

A Member stated that she did not agree with the findings of the EIP Panel and was of the view that, whilst there was no further scope for involvement, Members concerns ought to be placed on record on the basis that they were accountable to the electorate of Harrow.

The Portfolio Holder for Partnership and Property stated that there was a due process to be followed, that there was a Strategic London-wide body which gave the Mayor for London powers to make changes to the Plan. He added that the only recompense available was if the Mayor deviated from the Panel's recommendations. In the light of the fact that no further representations could be made within the constraints of the procedure for approval, he added that the report ought just to be noted without any further observations. The Chair was of the same view.

The Member responded and went on to mention that whilst she agreed with some of EIP Panel's findings on affordable housing, she did not agree with the following:

- Growth Assumptions - the views expressed in para 6.2(iii) of the transport infrastructure
- Housing Supply – para 6.4 requiring 23,000 additional dwellings annually with a possible review raising the figure to 30,000 which she felt would be very difficult for Harrow to achieve
- Cricklewood/Brent Cross – the approach taken would continue to undermine the vitality and viability of Harrow

Another Member enquired about the EIP Panel's views on Cricklewood and how this would be decided through development of the Sub Regional Development Framework as set out on page 9 of the officer's report. In response, the Chief Planning Officer stated that he hoped that consultation with the neighbouring boroughs would take place and that the regional framework would allow process representations to be made, especially in regard to the Cricklewood sidings.

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

That the response of the EIP Panel to Harrow's concerns over the draft London Plan be noted.

[REASON: To update the Members on the London Plan.]

**RECOMMENDATION 5 - Receipt of UDP Inspector's Report - Next Steps and Timetable to Adoption**

The Panel received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which included brief comments on the Inspector's Report, the next steps and the anticipated timetable up to adoption of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (HUDP). The report also referred to the parallel process of approval of the London Plan and commented on the implications of the new Local Development Framework.

In agreeing the timetable set out in the report, the Chair stressed the need to keep to the timetable and to ensure that the HUDP was submitted to Council for adoption on 29 April 2004, otherwise there would be further delay and the Plan would not be adopted until the July 2004 meeting of the Council. Members also agreed to hold two additional meetings in November 2003 in order to consider, in detail, the Inspector's recommendations and the Council's response to those recommendations.

The Chair was of the view that the lead in period to the preparation of the UDP was too long. In response, the Chief Planning Officer stated that the new legislation for the new system for Local Development Framework Plans, which was currently going through Parliament, would place a far greater burden on local authorities to produce their Local Development Framework Plans in a much shorter timescale. This, he added, would have resource implications for local authorities, including Harrow.

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

(1) That the receipt of the Inspector's Report on objections to the draft replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan be noted;

(2) that the timetable leading to adoption of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan by mid 2004 be agreed and that two additional meetings of the Panel be held on 12 and 18 November 2003 in order to consider the Inspector's Report and to decide what action to take in each of the Inspector's recommendations.

[REASON: To expedite adoption of the replacement Harrow Unitary Development Plan after completion of all statutory procedures.]

**PART II - MINUTES**

- 50. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at the meeting.
- 51. **Declarations of Interest:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of personal or prejudicial interest from Members of the Panel in relation to the business on the agenda.
- 52. **Arrangement of Agenda:**  
The Chair pointed out that the officer's report on the UDP Inspector's Report (Recommendation 5 refers) before the Panel that evening was merely to agree the timetable and that a more detailed report setting out the Inspector's recommendations and the Council's response to those recommendations would be presented to the two additional meetings (12 and 18 November 2003) of the Panel.  
**RESOLVED:** That all items be considered with the press and public present.
- 53. **Minutes:**  
**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.
- 54. **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).

55. **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).
56. **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).
57. **References from Council and Other Committees/Panels:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no references from Council and other Committees/Panels.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.15 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH BURCHELL  
Chair