

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING – 18 January 2017

PUBLIC QUESTIONS (ITEM 5)

Under Rule 17.1 of the Committee Procedure Rules, members of the public may question Chairs of Council Committees or Sub-Committees at meetings.

There is a time limit of **15 minutes** for the asking and answering of public questions.

1.

Questioner: Mr P Catherall, Resident

Asked of: Councillor Keith Ferry, Chair of Planning Committee

Question: Recommendations A and B to the Planning Committee in the Officer's report for P/1940/16 are without any prior condition to deliver the MOL swap despite the public being given written assurances that it would be secured as listed below.

1. Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) alludes to an MOL swap in principle and page 27 says that any MOL swap would be secured.
2. The applicant's Planning Statement paragraph 5.19 “..need to be secured...”
3. GLA's letter of 27 June 2016 to Harrow Council page 7 paragraph 32 “..need to be secured...”
4. The public reports pack of 16 November 2016 for P/1940/16 page 71 the first item of the table in section 4.11 lists the Mayor's response and requirement for the MOL swap and the Officer's reply clearly states that the suggested conditions have been attached. This is not true.

There is not any condition to deliver the swap attached to the recommendation by Harrow Planning Department (as set out on pages 102 –111 of the public report pack).

The public have not been given any advance notice of the details of the 'swapped in' MOL land as the first time this was published was on page 82 of the actually Planning Statement and residents are not happy with the proposed MOL swap. Before any damage is done to the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) the promised swap must be delivered.

Will the Council please explain how the condition in the draft SPD (page 29) that any MOL swap would be “subject to public consultation” has been satisfied and state why is a

condition to deliver the proposed MOL swap not being attached, and given that without its prior delivery, the approximately 3 times larger sports and conference centre substantially reduces the amount of MOL explain how can this not be contrary to London Plan policy 7.17?

Response: To be provided at the meeting by the Chair