Public Document Pack

Planning Committee Supplementary

Wednesday, 30 June 2010 at 7.00 pm
Committee Rooms 1, 2 and 3, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9HD

Membership:

Members Councillors:	**first alternates** Councillors:	**second alternates** Councillors:
R Patel (Chair)	Kabir	Kataria
Sheth (Vice-Chair)	Mistry	Mitchell Murray
Adeyeye	Long	Mashari
Baker	Steel	HM Patel
Cummins	Cheese	Allie
Daly	Naheerathan	Ogunro
Hashmi	Castle	Clues
Hossain	Thomas	Van Kalwala
Kataria	Oladapo	Powney
McLennan	J Moher	Moloney
CJ Patel	Lorber	Castle

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:
www.brent.gov.uk/committees

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 6.15pm in Committee Room 4

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM		WARD	PAGE
6.	2 Scrubs Lane, London, NW10 6RB (Ref 10/0585)	Kensal Green;	1 - 2

Supplementary Information **Item No.** **6**
Planning Committee on 30 June, 2010 **Case No.** 10/0585

Location 2 Scrubs Lane, London, NW10 6RB
Description Continued display of internally illuminated 7.5m x 5.0m advertisement hoarding on site of church on south of Harrow Road adjacent to existing petrol station and the installation of internally illuminated 6.0m x 3.0m hoarding at the junction of Harrow Road and Scrubs Lane.

Agenda Page Number: 53

Members visited the site on Saturday 26th June 2010. It was apparent that the landscaping required through the original planning consent for the church has not been provided.

For clarity, the landscaping details approved in application 08/0282 included the planting of 8 trees (3x on Harrow Road; 3x on the junction of Harrow Road and Scrubs Lane; 2x on Scrubs Lane). Three trees (Betula Pendula) were to be planted on the corner of the site among the giraffe sculptures, which were shown on the approved plan to be reinstated. These trees were specifically agreed as they are not a large dense tree and would not, therefore, obscure the art sculptures, or the building, but would serve to enhance the streetscene. The proposed retention of Panel 1 and the erection of Panel 2 would conflict with consistent Officer attempts over time, and adopted planning policy, to improve the appearance of the street-scene which was required to balance the impact of a far larger building at this prominent corner location.

To confirm the giraffe sculptures, which were granted planning permission in 1996, were erected and funded as part of Harlesden City Challenge. National Planning Guidance PPG19 "Outdoor Advertisement Control" and adopted policy BE21 of Brent's UDP 2004 note that advertisement hoarding's will not be acceptable where they detract from existing features or public realm enhancements. The location of Panel 2 will be sited directly in front of these sculptures and the trees required through approval 08/0282.

Response to applicants comments (provided at committee site visit)
A comprehensive supporting statement was distributed to Members at the visit on Saturday. The primary grounds of disputing the Council's stance relate to those specified in the reasons for refusal, namely the impact upon amenity and public safety. However, they also believe that the proposals accord with adopted planning policy.

Officers do not accept the arguments made within this Statement and would emphasize the following:

Policy BE21 is considered a material factor in terms of assessing amenity and public safety, on which to judge the effects of any advertisement. Whilst, design guidance SPG8 understands that applications should be assessed on a site by site basis this is to be viewed in conjunction with adopted policy.

To clarify, Panel 1 was approved (as all adverts are) for a limited five-year period, prior to the construction of the church and community centre. An advertisement hoarding of this nature would not normally be deemed acceptable where it would detract from the character of any new building and it is now a very different situation to the one in 2003 when the hoarding was approved.

National planning guidance PPG19 states that only where hoardings are positioned so as to

not to intrude upon existing features or landmarks will they be deemed acceptable and in prominent locations their effect upon pedestrians should not be overwhelming. In this instance, the proposed advertisements by reason of their size, scale and location, are considered to appear incongruous and over-dominant in the street-scene. They would be out of character, visually obtrusive to pedestrians and contrary to policy BE21.

In terms of the advertisement impacting on highway safety, Council Transportation Officers have highlighted that due to the location of the advertisement hoarding at major signalised junction it is likely to be distracting, where drivers have to take particular care, and therefore detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety. This view is supported by national guidance PPG19. Engineers have re-confirmed their objection to the proposal, in spite of been made aware of the views expressed by the applicant.

Summary
As noted in the committee report: Officers understand that the proposed advertisement hoardings are proposed to provide added revenue for the City Mission Church. However, this cannot be used as justification for the erection of advertisement hoarding's that are insensitively large and located; being visually obtrusive in the streetscene; detract from the character and appearance of the newly erected church and community building; and cause conditions which are prejudicial to public and highway safety.

All of these concerns are intensified when considered in relation to the failure to provide the landscaping which was considered essential (and agreed by the applicant) when the enlarged church building was approved in 2008. Not only has this landscaping not been provided, but unacceptable advert hoardings are now proposed, in one case, instead of any planting.

Recommendation: Remains refusal.

DocSuppF