



## Supplementary Planning Committee

**Tuesday 5 July 2016 at 7.00 pm**

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)  
Agha (Vice-Chair)  
Hylton  
Long  
Maurice  
Moher  
J Mitchell Murray  
Pitruzzella

#### Substitute Members

Councillors:

A Choudry, Colacicco, Daly, Ezeajughi, Hoda-Benn, Kabir, Khan and Naheerathan

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

**For further information contact:** Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1354; [joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk](mailto:joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:  
[democracy.brent.gov.uk](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

**Members' briefing will take place at 6.00pm**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>WARD</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
4. 1A-C, 3, 5A-D Deerhurst Road and Shree Swaminarayan Temple, 220-222 Willesden Lane, Willesden, London, NW2 (Ref. 15/4998)	Brondesbury Park	1 - 8
5. 5-9 Chippenham Gardens, London, NW6 5LH (Ref. 16/1191)	Kilburn	9 - 10

## Agenda Item 03

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 5 July, 2016

Case No. 15/4998

---

Location	1A-C, 3, 5A-D Deerhurst Road and Shree Swaminarayan Temple, 220-222 Willesden Lane, Willesden, London, NW2
Description	Erection of a three storey rear extension to the temple, and demolition of Nos 1, 3 and 5 Deerhurst Rd and erection of two 2 storey buildings with converted loft space providing a 14 bed care home and 5 self-contained flats (1 x 1bed, 1 x 2bed, 2 x 3bed and 1 x 4bed) with associated two storey basement level car and cycle parking and landscaping

#### Agenda Page Number: 23

#### Introduction

The application was removed from the agenda for the previous committee (8<sup>th</sup> June 2016) due to a technical difficulty in sending letters out to all interested parties which meant not all who commented on the application were notified of the committee date. Those difficulties have been addressed and the addresses that we have identified from the representations received have now been notified.

The report on this agenda is the same report as was included on the agenda for 8<sup>th</sup> June 2016, save for an improved wording for the recommendation. The substance of the recommendation has not changed.

This addendum to the committee report provides an update on the following issues:

1. Since the original committee report was published, Members have carried out a site visit.
2. Clarity is also provided on the number of representations received, pursuant to the Consultations section of the original report.
3. A request that the application be deferred has been received from a Ward Councillor
4. A number of further representations have been received from interested parties, including three Ward Councillors, the local residents' association CARO and members of the public, on a number of points which are summarised below in Section 4. The material planning considerations of each objection are collated and where officers believe these have been addressed satisfactorily in the original committee report, reference is made to the relevant paragraph.
5. A number of those representations relate to procedural matters, rather than material planning considerations, and these are addressed in Section 5

#### 1. Committee site visit

Members visited the site on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June at 6pm and viewed the site from Deerhurst Road, Willesden Lane and Yates Court and from various locations within the site.

Members raised the following points:

1. Differences between the withdrawn application and the current application
2. Garden space lost and insufficient soil depth for tree planting
3. Quiet nature of Deerhurst Road and impact of temple extension
4. Two-way road not feasible with parking bays on both sides, unregulated one-way working when busy
5. Impact of basement construction

##### 1.1 Differences between current application and withdrawn application

Members are asked to note that the 2013 application (LPA ref 13/0891 *for the erection of a rear extension to the temple, the demolition of 1, 3, 5 Deerhurst Road and the erection of three blocks comprising: Block A - 13 bedrooms care units, 2 staff units and 1 visitor unit; Block B - Lounge and 3 x One Bed; Block C - 12 flats;*

*Document Imaged*

DocSuppF  
Ref: 15/4998 Page 1 of 8

*and Two storey basement parking area with associated landscaping*) was withdrawn prior to being determined by Planning Committee in September 2013.

Your Officers are bound to consider the proposal before them on its own merits and therefore not only is there no obligation to compare this proposal to the withdrawn scheme, to do so in a way which would influence the recommendation would not be appropriate since a decision was not made on the withdrawn scheme. That notwithstanding, the proposed scheme is materially different to the withdrawn scheme in a number of important ways.

The main differences between this application and the current application are set below:

#### **1.1.1 Layout/appearance of care home/self-contained flats**

In the previous application three blocks (A, B and C) were proposed consisting of the care home, staff accommodation and self-contained flats to replace Nos. 1, 3 and 5 Deerhurst Road. Officers had concerns regarding the design, bulk and scale of the proposals which were likely to cause material harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents and to the character of the area. The current application differs in that the design and scale has also changed considerably from the previous application, to reflect the inter-war period dwellinghouses found in the surrounding area and your officers are satisfied any harmful impact on living conditions or the character of the area will be limited to acceptable levels.

#### **1.1.2 Principle of Care Home**

Previously the applicant was not able to demonstrate that providing a Care Home would meet the Development Plan. The applicant has now worked with Brent Adult Social Care to provide a facility that meets a recognised local need and therefore your officers can support this element of the proposal.

#### **1.1.3 Basement extension**

The basement has been reduced in scale to move away from the boundaries however it is clear your officers did not raise concerns with regard to the basement in 2013.

#### **1.1.4 Three storey rear extension to temple**

In terms of the scale the current application differs in that it is four metres less in width than what was previously proposed and therefore concerns raised in 2013 that the extension would harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents have now been addressed. The extensions have also been set in at first floor level by 9.4 metres and 14 metres at second floor level from the boundary with 224 Willesden Lane.

### **1.2 Garden space and soil depth**

The basement excavation will see the removal of the existing rear gardens whilst the two new buildings would have a combined footprint greater than that of the existing house. This reduction in garden space is not an unusual scenario and would occur when any property is extended: the point, rather, is whether the remaining garden space provides sufficient amenity space for the proposal and is in keeping with the character of the area and in this case the proposal meets those objectives as set out in paragraph 5.3 of the report.

The applicant has submitted details of soil depth at 600mm which satisfies the requirement for the planting of shrubs and grass; however, as outlined in paragraph 6.4 of the committee report, your officers have recommended that a condition requiring further details of soil depth at 1000mm in suitable locations is required for the planting of trees.

### **1.3 Character of Deerhurst Road**

Your officers are satisfied that the proposal, in terms of its visual impact and its impact in the sense of greater activity, would not materially harm the character of Deerhurst Road. Paragraph 4.1 of the committee report highlights the variety of buildings that are located on Willesden Lane and Deerhurst Road that range from the existing Temple, to three/four storey flats and large detached dwellinghouses.

The change in nature of the activity on the street as a result of the Temple extension is unlikely to be material as the proposal is not to increase capacity of the Temple. There may be some increase in activity as a result of the care home and the flats increasing the density of accommodation on that part of the site, however your officers do not feel that this would be to an unreasonable degree in the context of Deerhurst Road specifically or a relatively dense part of the borough in general.

### **1.4 Two-way traffic**

Parking bays are located on each side of Deerhurst Road close to the junction with Willesden Lane that currently results in two vehicles being unable to successfully pass each other when the bays are occupied by parked vehicles. Concerns have been raised regarding this arrangement and specifically when vehicles leave the Temple car park. In response to this Transport & Highways officers have suggested the retention of the advisory left-turn only arrow restriction on exiting the Temple to ensure that traffic exits via Chatsworth Road to reduce congestion at the Deerhurst Road/Willesden Lane junction and this can be secured as part of the planning obligation in respect of the CPZ review should Members be minded to grant planning permission, so that after a suitable period of time for this development to settle in a review is undertaken and should it prove necessary to amend the parking bays this is reviewed at that point. Your officers suggest a review be undertaken 12 months from practical completion of the Temple and basement works.

### **1.5 Impact of basement construction**

The estimated time of construction for the entire programme is 80 weeks. The Construction Management Plan (CMP) that has been prepared to reduce the impact on neighbouring residents states that the number of vehicle movements is expected to be 5-6 per day. Whilst your officers recognise that there is likely to be disruption caused by the excavation works for the basement, the harm caused to local residents is controlled under separate legislation to Planning and it is under Environmental Health legislation that the works would be controlled. It is not, therefore, appropriate to give weight to this disruption when coming to a conclusion as to whether this planning application is acceptable or not.

A number of representations have been received which suggest the basement proposal is contrary to policy: this is not the case. Brent does not have a policy in respect to basements and your officers do not believe the basement proposed here would give rise to a degree of harm as to materially harm the living conditions of local residents or the character of the area, and matters of flooding can be satisfactorily addressed.

## **2 Consultation and notification**

Your officers acknowledged in the Consultation section that there remained questions surrounding the manner in which consultations were initially treated as individual letters and a figure of 484 letters was quoted. Interested parties raised concerns that this did not accurately reflect the number of objections received. A thorough review of all representations received was carried out to ensure no material considerations were omitted and to ensure an accurate count of the volume of representations is given.

The following is a breakdown of the number of objections and comments in support of the application that were received. This includes whether the comments were submitted on the Council's website or in hard copies. The geographical location of the objectors/supporters has been removed and in the course of the assessment of the application consideration and weight has been given to the material planning considerations of each comment regardless of the location of the interested party.

- Total representations received opposing the proposal (including multiple comments from same address and same person): 733
- Total representations received supporting the proposal (including multiple comments from same address and same person): 64
- Petition in Support: two petitions, with 808 and 36 signatures respectively

In the usual course of events Officers would only log the comments in numerical terms to individual addresses regardless of the number of comments received from the same address. This is to prevent the system of reporting to committee where there are three objections from being abused, for instance in neighbour disputes whereby all occupants of a single house might object. This convention does not mean that material considerations are ignored, simply that those raised from a single address are collated, as all material considerations are collated and summarised. In this case, the number of letters received from individual addresses is 498 whilst the total letters and online comments from individual addresses are 550. Given the volume of objections received it is clear that the usual convention is unnecessary and hence all objections have been "counted", even if multiple objections from the same address or same person have been received.

The application was removed from the agenda in June due to technical difficulties whereby not all interested parties were notified of the committee date. This has been addressed and all parties have been notified save 40 whose addresses were either illegible or do not exist on the Council's property database.

During the early stages of consultation a comment in support of the application was wrongly attributed to an address due to a technical error when the comment was logged. This address was identified and the comment was subsequently removed from the Council's website. In addition to this six letters of objection

that were received by six separate individuals but from the same property have been queried by a member of the public. The member of the public has stated that their address has been wrongly used and that they did not wish to comment either in support or against the application. Therefore your officers have not included these six letters in the count above and the objections have been removed from the system.

### **3 Request to defer**

Ward Councillor Shaw has requested that the case be deferred for the following reasons:

- Traffic Survey and Travel Plan have not been updated since 2013.  
See below sections 4.3 and 4.4
- Claims made in the application have not been tested, for example the travel plan suggestion that numbers attending the temple will remain the same if extended and that the two-storey basement will not attract more traffic.  
See below section 4.3
- London wide concerns and developing policies which have not yet materialised (for example basements and use of cars) and therefore these points have not been sufficiently considered.  
See section 4.1
- This application only differs very slightly to the application of 2013 that was rejected.  
See section 1.1
- The extension of the consultation period was only mentioned on the website with no advertisement of this elsewhere.  
The consultation period is a minimum of 21 days from the last advertisement of the application and remains open until the day of Planning Committee

Your officers are of the opinion that there are no grounds for deferring this application.

### **4 Additional representations**

Additional representations have been received from a number of interested parties including Ward Councillors, CARO and two members of the public. Those representations are collated, summarised and addressed below, though where the representations raise material considerations already covered in the committee report, reference is made to the relevant section.

The representations are split into two categories: the first in Section 4 is to do with material considerations (albeit some of the comments do not raise material considerations) and the second in Section 5 to do with procedural matters.

#### **4.1 Basement**

CARO and other interested parties have raised concerns with the basement in respect of the principle of the basement being contrary to policy and its impact on air quality, traffic congestion, accidents and flooding.

Your Officers are satisfied that the basement meets the Development Plan. There are no policies regarding the prevention of basement development in the borough. This form of development is assessed against the relevant policies including the impact on character and neighbouring amenity. In addition to these policies, applicants are required to submit construction method statements outlining how mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce nuisance on local residents.

Basement development has been addressed in paragraphs 1.1.9, 3.2.1-3.2.4 and 6.2 of the committee report. Air pollution has been addressed in section 4.6 of this report.

The impact of construction of the car park has been addressed in paragraphs 3.2.1 – 3.2.3 of the committee report.

Flooding has been addressed in paragraph 3.2.4 of the committee report.

#### **4.2 Parking**

Interested parties have raised concerns with the failure to make reference to Brent's' policy that it "does not make any special arrangements for parking for religious festivals or places of worship" and that the amount of parking would not comply with the draft Development Management Policies (DMP). Concerns have also been raised with regard to the failure to distinguish between parking for worship and parking for assembly and leisure.

Paragraph 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the committee report deal specifically with parking standards that are contained

in the UDP (2004) and also the emerging standards contained in the draft DMP. Visitor numbers to the Temple for religious purposes are such that the number of parking spaces proposed can be accommodated by Brent's parking standards as set out in the Development Plan. Your officers have given no special weight to the fact the parking is for a place of worship.

Concerns were raised regarding the selective and partial use of data and specifically the number of existing car parking spaces at the Temple. There is an error in the report where in paragraph 2.2.1 incorrect figures are referenced. For clarity, Officers have counted the number of existing and proposed parking spaces and there are 58 existing for the Temple and 106 proposed comprising 97 for the Temple, two for the care home and seven for the residential units. Of the 97 for the Temple, 20 will be for disabled and 19 will be for electric vehicle charging, whilst of the two for the care home, one will be for disabled.

#### **4.3 Traffic impact and congestion**

There have been some questions from local residents about the veracity of numbers of people who presently attend the Temple and who park in the local area. A member of the public has queried the number of annual visitors to the Temple as stated in the applicants' statement of use compared to the Council's Highways Committee in 2013 and the Temple's annual return.

Your officers have tested this application against the Development Plan on the basis of the information submitted in support of the current application and have given weight to a proposed Temple Management Plan which would impose new controls on numbers for large religious events and weddings, which the Applicant has accepted in principle. Further information regarding the proposed Temple Management Plan can be found in paragraph 1.1.4 of the committee report.

CARO and a member of the public have raised concerns with the failure to have regard to the number of users at any one time. This has been addressed in paragraph 1.1 – 1.1.4 of the committee report; however, to be clear, it is not possible to know precisely how many people visit the Temple at specific times on specific days: sensible assumptions based on realistic patterns of usage must be made, based on an objective review of evidence provided by the Applicant. The Applicant has stated that the purpose of the extension is not to increase the capacity of the Temple and your officers are satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that this is the case. Your officers are also satisfied that the range of numbers of people who generally attend particular prayers or particular community activities is reasonable in the context of a Hindu temple with a base congregation in the region of 700 people (based on the statement on page 16 of the Statement of Use, April 2016). As an example, on Sunday prayers between 16.00 and 19.00 up to 700 people attend the Temple, however not all of the congregation would attend every Sunday and not all would attend at the same time as the session does not involve a sermon or other fixed event; some arrive at the beginning and others arrive at the end. Therefore it is necessary to make sensible assumptions based on the upper range of the likely number of visitors and model the impact of those sensible assumptions on parking and traffic congestion in the area.

A member of the public has also provided an analysis of the peak number of people attending the Temple from a Highways perspective. Your Highway officers have reviewed the analysis and conclude it seems correct, given the limited information available and the likelihood that not all 700 people attend Sunday prayers for the full three hours. The survey report was upfront about the Sunday in 2015 on which the survey was undertaken not being a peak occasion, as there was no wedding or other function occurring on that day. The previous survey from June 2013 showed a higher number of parked cars in the area, as there was a function occurring on that day. It would therefore appear from this analysis that the actual attendance for typical Sunday prayers is as expected: there are not routinely 700 people at the Temple throughout the entirety of the prayer event. During the 2013 parking survey a wedding was going on at the same time as the evening prayers, which would not be permitted under the proposed Temple Management Plan (as the wedding would have to finish before the 4pm prayer time)

There is a known parking problem in the area created by Temple visitors, particularly on Sunday evenings, the scale of which varies depending on the numbers of people in the Temple and which at present is not subject to any planning control whatsoever. Deerhurst Road and Chatsworth Road can always be expected to suffer difficulties, with special events spreading parking further afield into Coverdale Road and Willesden Lane. The application is an opportunity to help to tackle existing problems by providing more parking within the site to take pressure away from the surrounding streets, by providing a Travel Plan and most importantly, by providing the Council with the funds to undertake a review of the local CPZ's to amend operational hours, if necessary. Your officers conclude that the proposal would be unlikely to materially worsen the existing situation.

Some interested parties have indicated the traffic assessment is out of date. For clarity, a Supplementary

Highways Note dated 22/07/2015 and prepared by Paul Mew Associates was sent in hard copy to the Transportation officer in response to their comments at pre-application stage and this formed a part of the submission of this planning application in addition to the Paul Mew Associates Transport Assessment dated October 2014. It is this Supplementary Highways Note (which Officers have referred to as a Transport Note in paragraph 2.4.1 of the report) that forms the basis of Officers analysis and conclusions on the matter of traffic impact and your Officers consider this is sufficiently accurate.

#### **4.4 Travel Plan**

CARO have raised concerns with the failure to exercise professional judgment with regard to the Temple's claims about car usage and the inadequate Travel Plan. This has been addressed in paragraphs 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 of the committee report. The Travel Plan, dated October 2015, is considered Good except for some changes that are required, to be addressed in a revised Travel Plan pursuant to a legal agreement.

CARO have raised concerns with regard to the road safety black spot in Willesden Lane. Your officers confirm that personal injury accident rates in the area are very low, with two accidents close to the Willesden Lane/Deerhurst Road junction and two close to the Chatsworth Road/Deerhurst Road junction of the most recently available 36 month period.

The encouragement of further traffic has been addressed in section 2 – Parking and Access in the committee report. Your Officers are satisfied that, subject to a revised Travel Plan being approved as part of a planning obligation under a S106 legal agreement, this proposal would be unlikely to materially worsen, and the Travel Plan is an opportunity to materially improve the existing poor situation.

#### **4.5 Cycling**

Concerns have been raised that insufficient regard has been paid to the impact of this proposal on the safety of cyclists and in particular on the Chatsworth Road Quietway. This is addressed in section 2.6 of the committee report. During construction there will be a significant increase in the number of heavy vehicles accessing the site along Deerhurst Road and a Construction Management Plan will be imposed via condition, should Members resolve to grant planning permission, which shall include measures to ensure highway and pedestrian safety is given due regard when undertaking construction works and will include a requirement for HGVs etc to access and egress the site via the Willesden Lane/Deerhurst Road junction and so to avoid Chatsworth Road.

#### **4.6 Environmental Health**

Concerns have been raised by objectors regarding air pollution and the potential impact of vehicles using the temple. Environmental Health officers have submitted a detailed response to all queries that have been raised, as follows below.

The Council is aware of the report 'Every breath we take'. With regard to the policies regarding air pollution caused by cars, this is a key consideration when planning new transport and development schemes and consideration is given to this in Development Plan policies such as London Plan policy 7.14 and Core Strategy policy CP19. The Council are currently in the process of drafting a new air quality action plan.

With regard to the Development Plan policies and the potential impact for the health of residents in the care home, the proposed number of car parking spaces associated with the Temple may lead to short term, marginal increases in local air pollution but the residents would be located at a sufficient distance away from the source and would therefore not be affected. In any event further details of ventilation could be requested to improve indoor air quality.

With regard to the implications of increasing air pollution from cars in the residential area the potential exposure to pollution is limited by the fact the residential premises are located some distance from the car park as a pollutant source.

With regard to the location of a car park located close to public transport and the potential discouragement of the use of this form of transport, Environmental Health officers are in agreement that the Council has taken this into account when considering the planning application and as a result the developers will be required to commit to a Travel Plan with the aim of reducing car use over time. In respect of public health, the proposal is judged to be in compliance with policies 7.14 and 3.2 of the London Plan, which seek to coordinate action on the environment, climate change and public health. In respect of the environment and climate change, the proposal is judged to provide sufficient replacement planting to replace that lost by the works and mitigation measure are in place to address changes to run-off whilst the development is designed to achieve a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. In respect of Policy CP19 of the Core Strategy 2010 and a requirement for BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes for major developments, this is superseded by



the more up to date London Plan policies in respect of climate change, hence BREEAM is not sought.

Your Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not materially worsen the existing situation in respect of air quality and public health and the aforementioned Construction Management Plan will seek to control dust and emissions from construction works in accordance with the London Plan and *The Control Of Dust And Emissions During Construction And Demolition* Supplementary Planning Guidance (GLA, 2014)

#### **4.7 Increase in footprint of existing buildings 1, 3 and 5 Deerhurst Road.**

The design of the care home and residential units that are proposed to replace 1, 3 and 5 Deerhurst Road has been addressed in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of the committee report. Your Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area.

#### **4.8 Users and supporters are not local**

Concerns were raised that the users of the site are not from the local area and that the number of vehicles used to access the temple clogs up the surrounding roads. In response to this with regard to the users of the site, the Temple attracts visitors from within and outside the borough. In response to the number of vehicles that clog up the surrounding roads this has been addressed in paragraph 2.4.4 of the committee report.

#### **4.9 Accuracy of plans**

A member of the public has stated that there are inaccuracies in the plans with regard to the height of the building at three storeys, the scale, and the lack of scale on one drawing. The Temple consists of three storeys however the ground floor has a large interior ceiling that is essentially double height. However the building is considered a three storey building as it has a ground, first and second floor. All of the drawings contain a scale bar and accurately show the buildings as they will appear if constructed. None of the proposed drawings show that the temple and the care home/residential units are the same height. On some drawings different scales are used to give a bigger picture or to show the buildings in the context of each other.

#### **4.10 Review of the CPZ**

A member of the public has queried whether a review of the CPZ could be successfully implemented due to a petition to review a CPZ in the area in 2014. In section 5.18 of the applicants' Travel Plan they have stated that they intend to lobby the Council to introduce a localised time period Controlled Parking Zone. This would mean that only residents were permitted to park on-street during this period and parking on single yellow lines would be prohibited to this period. Non-residents would have to park much further afield and walk to the Temple or pay for parking in shared use bays. This would effectively restrict objections to an extension of the CPZ operating hours into evenings and weekends and would therefore allow local residents to extend the existing hours and help to improve the on-street parking situation in the area. Your Officers have given only limited weight to the merit of these changes to the CPZ as current practice within the Council is to not go ahead with significant CPZ changes if local residents are against it; therefore your Officers cannot be certain these improvements will be made, however your Officers consider it to be important that the review at least be undertaken and hence the requirement that the Applicant pay a financial contribution to facilitate the review and subsequent changes if required.

#### **4.11 Wedding Facility**

A member of the public has queried how a regular congregation of 500-600 patrons can generate numbers of 700 for a wedding. In response to this your officers consider that it is not unreasonable to accept that guests who are not normally attendees of the temple or not local people can attend a wedding ceremony as guests of the regular attendees. The primary use of the Temple is as a religious facility for religious purposes. It is not unusual for religious places to be used as wedding venues and your officers recognise that different religious or cultural groups have different traditions and practices when it comes to wedding sizes and the number of guests that attend. Weddings of up to 700 guests are not unusual within the Hindu community.

#### **4.12 School**

A member of the public has made a point about the school and the size of the existing classrooms. Your officers are satisfied that the classrooms would not give rise to unacceptable harm and are not used for a school but rather for a variety of classes. Information regarding the proposed use of the classrooms is contained in paragraphs 1.1.7 and 1.1.8 of the committee report.

#### **4.13 Development permitted for social housing is now privately let**

This statement refers to a property that is not located within the application site nor does it have anything to do with the application. This is therefore not considered to be a material consideration in the assessment of the application.

#### **4.14 Right to Light**

A member of the public has raised a query regarding 'Right to Light'. Right to light is a matter of purely private interest and is not a public interest. In the course of the assessment of the proposed development the Council assessed whether the loss of light would be materially harmful and not whether 'right to light' is breached. In addition to this a member of the public similarly questioned the impact of the proposed extension to the temple on the residents of No. 224 Willesden Lane. Paragraphs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of the committee report deal specifically with the impact of the proposed temple extension on the adjoining property, No.224 Willesden Lane.

#### **4.15 Differences between this application and 2013 application**

See section 1.1 above

#### **4.16 Planning enforcement**

CARO have raised concerns with the failure to bring to members' attention past failures by the Temple including planning enforcement matters. This is a separate issue to the current planning application and is not considered to be a material planning consideration in the assessment of the current application.

### **5 Procedural matters**

#### **5.1 Inaccuracies and omitted information**

Members are asked to note that a number of representations have claimed that there are inaccuracies or omitted information in the report. Your officers are of the opinion that these claims are largely without substance however the following inaccuracies are noted and Members are asked to consider the following information as clarifying that given in the committee report:

5.1.1 Number of existing and proposed parking spaces

See section 4.2

5.1.2 Number of Public comments and how those are represented

See section 2 above.

#### **5.2 Supplementary Report**

Local residents and Ward Councillors have queried the timing of the publishing of this report on the grounds that they will not have the opportunity to digest the information. Supplementary reports are prepared as close to Committee as possible to accommodate last minute representations or changes.

#### **5.3 Failure to notify interested parties**

See section 2 above

#### **5.4 Site visit**

In previous Planning Committees site visits were undertaken for the majority of Committee cases however recently this position has been reviewed to return to the procedures set out in the Planning Code of Conduct and site visits are now only undertaken when Members request them. Members of the Planning Committee requested that a site visit be undertaken and this was carried out on 6 June.

#### **5.5 Use of term 'extension'**

The word 'extension' was applied to both the proposed temple and basement extension. The development to the Temple involves a three storey extension to the rear of the building. The basement extension will see the creation of a two storey basement extension underneath the Temple and underneath the proposed care home and residential units.

#### **5.6 Revised information**

All revised plans and documents have been loaded to the public access system.

**Recommendation:** Remains as set out in the Committee report

DocSuppF

## Agenda Item 05

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 5 July, 2016

Case No.

16/1191

---

Location	5-9 Chippenham Gardens, London, NW6 5LH
Description	Demolition of existing buildings at 5-9 Chippenham Gardens, Kilburn Park Post Office and 4-26 Stuart Road (even numbers) and construction of part-four, -five and -six storey building comprising 52 self contained flats (24 x 1 bed, 19 x 2 bed and 9 x 3 bed) with associated highway works, hard and soft landscaping, cycle and refuse provision and alterations to Chippenham Gardens

#### **Agenda Page Number: 73**

Your Officers have been made aware that an objector to the application has made submissions to the Council's South Kilburn Regeneration team, which include some comments specific to this case. The basis of the comments is that the proposal departs from the South Kilburn Masterplan (described in the objectors e-mail as the Neighbourhood Masterplan) and the lack of retained commercial frontage facing Chippenham Gardens. The site specific justification and commentary is expanded upon in points 2.1 and 4.2 within the main report. It is the view of your officers that the proposal is both broadly consistent with the aims and objectives of the South Kilburn Masterplan and in particular those parts relating to the Village Quarter particularly in terms of the density and scale of the proposal, its relationship with Chippenham Gardens--which is a significant improvement in your Officers' opinions--and the wider Development Plan, despite the proposal not including re-provision of the Post Office for reasons set out in the main report.

**Recommendation: Remains as set out in the original report**

DocSuppF

**This page is intentionally left blank**