



Supplementary Planning Committee

Wednesday 10 June 2020 at 6.00 pm

This will be held as an online virtual meeting

Details on how to access the link in order to view proceedings will be made available online via the following link: [Democracy in Brent](#)

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Denselow (Chair)
Johnson (Vice-Chair)
S Butt
Chappell
Hylton
Mahmood
Maurice
Sangani

Substitute Members

Councillors:

Ahmed, Dar, Ethapemi, Kabir, Kennelly, Lo and W Mitchell Murray

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Governance Officer
joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk; 020 8937 1354

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

Members' virtual briefing will take place at 5.00pm.

The press and public are welcome to attend this as an online virtual meeting. The link to attend and view proceedings will be made available online via the following link: [Democracy in Brent](#)

Notes for Members - Declarations of Interest:

If a Member is aware they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest* in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent and must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item.

If a Member is aware they have a Personal Interest** in an item of business, they must declare its existence and nature at the start of the meeting or when it becomes apparent.

If the Personal Interest is also significant enough to affect your judgement of a public interest and either it affects a financial position or relates to a regulatory matter then after disclosing the interest to the meeting the Member must leave the room without participating in discussion of the item, except that they may first make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the matter, provided that the public are allowed to attend the meeting for those purposes.

***Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:**

- (a) **Employment, etc.** - Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit gain.
- (b) **Sponsorship** - Any payment or other financial benefit in respect of expenses in carrying out duties as a member, or of election; including from a trade union.
- (c) **Contracts** - Any current contract for goods, services or works, between the Councillors or their partner (or a body in which one has a beneficial interest) and the council.
- (d) **Land** - Any beneficial interest in land which is within the council's area.
- (e) **Licences** - Any licence to occupy land in the council's area for a month or longer.
- (f) **Corporate tenancies** - Any tenancy between the council and a body in which the Councillor or their partner have a beneficial interest.
- (g) **Securities** - Any beneficial interest in securities of a body which has a place of business or land in the council's area, if the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body or of any one class of its issued share capital.

****Personal Interests:**

The business relates to or affects:

(a) Anybody of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management, and:

- To which you are appointed by the council;
- which exercises functions of a public nature;
- which is directed to charitable purposes;
- whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy (including a political party or trade union).

(b) The interests a of a person from whom you have received gifts or hospitality of at least £50 as a member in the municipal year;

or

A decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial position of:

- You yourself;
- a member of your family or your friend or any person with whom you have a close association or any person or body who is the subject of a registrable personal interest.

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
3. 19/1241 Car Park next to Sudbury Town Station, Station Approach, Wembley, HA0 2LA	Sudbury	1 - 2
4. 19/3092 Ujima House, 388 High Road, Wembley, HA9 6AR	Wembley Central	3 - 6
5. 19/2804 Chancel House, Neasden Lane, London, NW10	Dudden Hill	7 - 8
6. 19/4434 Pharamond Garages, rear of 258-262 Willesden Lane, Willesden, London	Brondesbury Park	9 - 12

Date of the next meeting: **Wednesday 24 June 2020**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Agenda Item 03

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 10 June, 2020

Case No.

19/1241

Location	Car Park next to Sudbury Town Station, Station Approach, Wembley, HA0 2LA
Description	Re-development of existing car park for the erection of two blocks of residential dwellings, with associated residential amenity space, refuse storage, cycle parking, landscaping and other ancillary works, together with re-provision of disabled car parking bays nearest to Station Approach to serve Sudbury Town Underground Station (DEPARTURE FROM POLICY CP21 OF BRENT'S LOCAL PLAN).

Agenda Page Number: 13-58

Further representations

19 additional objections have been received from local residents to the proposal, as well as objections received from two residents writing on behalf of the 'South Sudbury Residents Association'. The objections raised largely re-iterate concerns previously raised concerning the loss of the car park and the impacts of this on parking demand within local streets. Officers consider that these issues have been covered sufficiently within the original committee report and the addendum report.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the density of the proposed development, its height and scale in relation to the Grade II* listed station and the surrounding area, the affordability and mix of the proposed flats, sunlight, overshadowing and overlooking impacts to neighbouring properties, and issues of increased crime, rubbish and anti-social behaviour connected with the loss of the car park. Again, officers consider that these issues are satisfactorily addressed in the original committee report.

Objections have also been raised concerning the lack of public participation and inadequate communication through the application process, particularly given the 'virtual' nature of the committee meeting. Officers consider that, as when the application was presented to the last committee meeting, all statutory requirements have been met with regard to how the application has been handled and publicised.

Objections have also been raised concerning the impact of the proposed development on local property prices. Officers consider that this is not a material planning consideration, and therefore cannot be viewed as a valid reason on which to refuse planning permission.

Three further comments in support have been received to the proposal. The grounds for support re-iterate those already set out in the original committee report.

A query has also been received from Councillor Maurice regarding parking and drop-off arrangements outside the station on Station Approach, and the proximity of alternative stations providing step-free access within Brent. Cllr Maurice states that the land in front of the station (i.e. the forecourt) belongs to and is managed by Transport for London (London Underground).

Policing it which includes traffic regulations are dealt with under Railway Bylaws, rather than by Brent Council. Cllr Maurice also states that the only other step free access stations in Brent are Wembley Park and Kilburn, and there are no other step-free access stations for approx. 5 miles.

In response, officers confirm that the forecourt area is owned and managed by Transport for London, which was previously stated in the original committee report. It is therefore subject to private parking enforcement. There is no signage to restrict access to the station forecourt area for any particular types of vehicles (e.g. buses only), so any vehicle is entitled to drive onto the station forecourt. There are, as Cllr. Maurice states, double yellow lines in place along the station frontage and signs stating "No Parking – Offenders will be prosecuted". There are also bus stop clearway markings at the two bus stops, with signs stating "No Stopping except buses".

Officers also confirm that the road markings and signage otherwise accords fully with Traffic Sign Regulations (as would be expected from an organisation that also acts as a Highway Authority), so the restrictions along the front of the station convey the same meaning as if they would if located on a length of public highway.

The restrictions therefore allow drivers to pull up on the double yellow lines to drop-off and pick-up passengers, as long as they do so on the double yellow lines and not at the bus stops. There is also a reasonable allowance for vehicles to wait for a short period of time if necessary if the driver stays with the vehicle. The restrictions do not allow cars to park and the driver to leave the vehicle.

With regard to step-free stations in the area, officers note that there are several other stations in Brent which provide this. It is important to note that the nearest alternative step-free station is Wembley Central, approximately 1.3km to the east, which also benefits from a large car park beneath Central Square. This car park contains 242 spaces, which includes 19 disabled spaces and has a lift providing access to the shopping level and Station above. In addition, Greenford provides step-free access, and is approximately 2.5km to the southwest.

Amendments to main report

The addendum report refers to an '*increase in the level of contribution of off-site Affordable Housing to 600,000*' within the final officer's recommendation section (page 17). To clarify, part 1B (c) of the recommendations section (page 18) should therefore be amended to read as follows:

- ‘c) *Provision of affordable housing*
 - 52 units at an intermediate rate (80% of market rate),*
 - Approval and implementation of a Marketing Methods Plan*
 - Payment of £600,000 towards the provision of off-site affordable housing.***

Recommendation: Continues to be grant, subject to the conditions and (updated) s106 Heads of Terms as set out in the original committee report and addendum report.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 4

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 10 June, 2020

Case No.

19/3092

Location	Ujima House, 388 High Road, Wembley, HA9 6AR
Description	Demolition of the existing building and erection of a new building up to a maximum height of 39.6m comprising up to 5,000sqm residential floorspace (Use Class C3), up to 600sqm of flexible workspace (Use Class B1A, B and C), with ancillary cafe (Use Class A3) up to 600sqm ancillary floorspace, associated hard and soft landscaping, wheelchair car and cycle parking.

Agenda Page Number: 59 - 102

Additional objection

The Introduction section of the committee report summarises concerns raised on behalf of the owner of the adjoining site at Lanmor House (370 to 386 High Road) and part owner of 26-29 Ecclestone Place. A further objection letter from the same objector was received on 9 June 2020, and is discussed below.

Engagement with applicant

The objector raises concerns that they have not had an opportunity for discussions with the applicant following the deferral of the application. However, there is no statutory requirement under planning legislation for the applicant to engage with the owners of neighbouring properties either before or during the application process. As highlighted in the main report, consultation on the application has been undertaken in line with statutory requirements and the Brent Statement of Community Involvement.

Daylight and sunlight

As noted in paragraph 77 of the Committee Report, an updated Daylight and Sunlight Report was submitted following the deferral of the application. The objector raises concerns that the technical assessment of impacts on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties has not altered, but that the text and interpretation of the results has been “shifted to downplay the detrimental effects” and to “skew the results towards a favourable outcome”. A key point of the objection is that they consider the flank elevation windows should be considered to be main windows as they serve main living spaces, and that 7 of these windows would fail to meet BRE target values.

The impact on Lanmor House is addressed in detail in paragraphs 79 to 82 in the Committee report. An impact on these windows is highlighted. It is also important to note that the BRE guidance states that it should be interpreted flexibly and that different target values could be appropriate for example in densely developed urban contexts. The NPPF paragraph 123 also states that a flexible approach to daylight standards should be taken in order to make efficient use of sites. The benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the harm on the light received by adjoining properties.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

The objector raises concerns that small front and rear-facing windows in the gable end shown on the indicative floorplans could provide a line of sight into habitable rooms in Lanmor House. However, these plans are indicative only at this stage, and the scope for overlooking would be assessed at the reserved matters stage and any concerns resolved at that stage.

Highway matters

Brent's transport officers and the applicant's transport consultant have now provided more detailed comments in respect of highway matters raised in the original objection letter, and these are discussed below.

Construction traffic

On construction matters, the objector mentions the narrow width of the western end of Ecclestone Place,
Document Imaged

DocSuppF

Ref: 19/3092 Page 1 of 3

which is proposed to be temporarily converted to two-way operation. The width is about 5m, which is sufficient for a lightly trafficked two-way road. However, if two lorries were to meet along its length they would struggle to pass one another. The Construction Logistics Plan would need to address this through measures such as the pre-booking of deliveries, radioed instructions to approaching and departing drivers and use of traffic marshals to hold departing vehicles on site if necessary until the exit route is clear.

The objector has raised issues with the tracking, including that vehicles would overhang the High Road footway and would conflict with the fencing along the railway cutting. However your transport officers consider that there is some leeway in the tracking, and do not consider this to be a major concern. The applicant's transport consultant has confirmed that whilst the tracking diagrams show the body of construction vehicles overhanging over the footway at some points, this could be safely controlled by traffic marshals and there would be no wheel intrusion onto the footway and so no footway strengthening works would be required.

The objector also mentions a 15 tonne weight limit along the private road to the rear of their site, which would restrict the size of construction vehicles. This is a private road and no information is available at this stage as to the reasons for the weight limit. If it relates to the structural integrity of the railway cutting, then the necessary enabling works may not be achievable, however construction access for larger vehicles could be provided from the High Road with appropriate mitigation measures in place such as loading bays to the front and scaffolding tunnels over the footway.

The Construction Logistics Plan is only an initial outline document at this stage. The Plan would be subject to further development as a final Plan to be submitted and approved, when the contractor is appointed and before work starts on site. Condition 11 is proposed to be amended as follows to ensure these issues are addressed in the Construction Logistics Plan:

"Prior to commencement of development, a Construction Logistics Plan, identifying anticipated construction traffic movements and setting out measures to manage and minimise the construction traffic impacts arising from the development, taking into account other construction projects in the vicinity, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Plan shall include:

- details of the proposed enabling works to allow two-way traffic including large construction vehicles on Ecclestone Place, together with measures to ensure that this two-way traffic can operate safely at all times;
- or
- details of alternative construction access from the High Road for large construction vehicles, including appropriate measures to mitigate potential impacts on pedestrian and vehicle movements on the High Road.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved Construction Logistics Plan.

Reason: To ensure construction traffic impacts are effectively managed throughout the construction process.

Reason for pre-commencement condition: Construction traffic impacts can arise at any time from the commencement of works, and adequate controls need to be in place from this time."

Servicing and deliveries

The objector notes that servicing and delivery vehicles would need to use the eastern section of Ecclestone Place, following removal of the temporary two-way route. As pointed out, the road is narrow and features a number of tight right-angle bends, so is difficult to manoeuvre along. However, it is a one-way road that is already used by service and delivery vehicles to properties along Ecclestone Place and the rear of High Road, so this proposal does not materially worsen matters in this respect.

The applicant's transport consultant has provided further tracking diagrams to demonstrate that a left turn by a refuse vehicle into the eastern section of Ecclestone Place from the north would be an easier manoeuvre with a greater tolerance to the kerb edge of the footway than the right turn from the south that refuse vehicles currently make.

Access to the proposed building

The objector refers to a through route for pedestrians and cyclists to access the cycle parking at the rear, and suggests that this would be too narrow to prevent conflicts during busy times. This route would be a 3m wide

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 19/3092 Page 2 of 3

corridor providing access from the High Road entrance to the residential units above and through the building to the rear of the site. This is considered to be sufficient width to allow pedestrians and cyclists to pass one another. Furthermore, cyclists would also be able to use the vehicular access via Ecclestone Place.

Recommendation: Remains to Grant outline permission subject to the Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London and the conditions and informatives as set out in the report.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 10 June, 2020

Case No.

19/2804

Location	Chancel House, Neasden Lane, London, NW10
Description	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a secondary school with sixth-form arranged in a 5 storey building incorporating a multi-use games area (MUGA) at roof level and incidental works to include landscaping, play-areas, means of enclosure, access and car and cycle parking (Departure from Local Plan, however site allocated for education use in emerging Brent Local Plan 2019 – BSSA19)

Agenda Page Number: 103 - 130

Since the publication of the agenda an objection has been received from a local resident. This resident previously commented on the application and raised objection to the development on the basis of increased noise, traffic, air pollution, nuisance and anti-social behaviour. These issues have already been addressed in the main report.

Air Quality

The site falls within an AQMA a recent publication by Wembley Matters raised concern with allowing a new school in an area with poor air quality, particularly an open roof MUGA. As discussed in the main body of the report, the application site has been identified as being one of the ones in the borough suitable to accommodate a school.

The London Plan places great emphasis on the importance of tackling air pollution and improving air quality. It therefore states that development proposals should minimise exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems of air quality such as by design solutions, buffer zones or steps to promote greater use of sustainable transport modes.

The development makes a particular contribution through promoting greater use of sustainable transport modes. The existing Chancel House site currently benefits from a large car parking area with 189 car parking spaces. Under the proposed scheme only 11 spaces are to be retained. To further discourage car use to the site a travel plan is to be secured via the s106 agreement to promote walking and cycling to the site. Sustainable transport modes are also promoted through on site cycle parking provision and the contribution to TfL for local bus services.

As required by the London Plan, the application has been accompanied by an Air Quality Assessment and an Air Quality Neutral Assessment. The submitted Air Quality Assessment concludes that air quality levels would not exceed air quality objectives when the site is operational, with the Air Quality Neutral Assessment confirming that the development is better than air quality neutral in terms of both transport and building emissions. The submission therefore demonstrates that air quality in the area will not have an adverse impact on the proposed school, and that the proposed development will not worsen air quality.

Conditions

Errors were identified on some of the revision numbers to the approved drawings. Condition 2 has therefore been updated to read

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

10010 Rev P01
10100 Rev P01
10101 Rev P01
10102 Rev P01
10103 Rev P01

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 19/2804 Page 1 of 2

*10104 Rev P01
10105 Rev P01
10110 Rev P01
10200 Rev P02
10300 Rev P01
19-407-TLP-PA01 Rev A
19407-TLP-CP06
10601 Rev P02
10600 Rev P02
19407-TLP-PA06
19407-TLP-PA05
3220-1100-T-021
FS0616-BMD-ZZ-00-DR-D-59000-P03*

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

The arboricultural report referenced in condition 4 is incorrect and this condition has been updated to read:

The works shall be carried out in full accordance with the measures specified in the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (AIA AMS The Landscape Partnership 01/08/19')

Reason: In order to ensure that nearby trees are safeguarded during the works.'

Recommendation: Recommendation remains approval subject to conditions

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 6

Agenda Item 06

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 10 June, 2020

Case No.

19/4434

Location	Pharamond Garages, rear of 258-262 Willesden Lane, Willesden, London
Description	Demolition of the existing garages and redevelopment to provide a four storey building comprising 10 self-contained flats with associated car parking, cycle and refuse storage, amenity space and landscaping.

Agenda Page Number: 131-162

Amended Plans

Since the publication of the agenda the applicant has submitted the following revised plans:

- 618-2b-100_D – Proposed Site Plan
- 618-2b-110_B – Proposed Ground Floor
- 618-2b-111_B – Proposed First and Second Floor
- 618-2b-112_C – Proposed Third Floor and Roof
- 618-2b-200_B – Proposed Sections
- 618-2b-201 – Proposed Sections
- 618-2b-300_B – Proposed South and North Elevations
- 618-2b-301_B – Proposed East and West Elevations
- 618-2b-900_B – Proposed Views

Summary of amendments

The plans include amendments to address the issues discussed in the committee report regarding the proximity of balconies to the adjoining gardens. In addition to this, amendments to the first floor layout are proposed, changing a 2-bedroom flat into a 3-bedroom flat and changing another 2-bedroom flat into a 1-bedroom flat.

The changes to the flats are as follows:

Flats 01 to 03: No change

Flat 04: was 2-bedroom 4-person, now 1-bedroom 2-person

Flat 05: was 2-bedroom 4-person, now 3-bedroom 5 person

Flats 6-10: No changes

Flat	Internal change
01 to 03	No change
04	Was 2-bedroom 4-person, now 1-bedroom 2-person
05	Was 2-bedroom 4-person, now 3-bedroom 5 person
06 to 10	No change

The scheme now includes three 3-bedroom flats (30 %) and it therefore exceeding the 25 % target for 3-bedroom homes set out in adopted and emerging policy. All homes would continue to be for Affordable Rent.

The changes to the mix of homes is as follows:

	Previously proposed	Now proposed
1-bedroom	2	3
2-bedroom	6	4
3-bedroom	2	3

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 19/4434 Page 1 of 3

All flats as revised would meet internal space standards.

Balconies

The balconies have been relocated and re-sized to address the privacy issues discussed in the main report. The changes are as follows:

Flat	Change	Original size	Size now proposed
01 to 02	No change		
03	Relocated within eastern façade and reduced in size to ensure at least 9 m from boundary (1-bedroom flat)	7 sqm	5 sqm
04	No change		
05	Flat now 3-bedroom 5-person, additional balcony provided in western façade	8 sqm	12 sqm
06	Relocated from northern to eastern façade and reduced in size to ensure at least 9 m from boundary (1-bedroom flat)	7 sqm	5 sqm
07	Relocated from eastern to southern façade (2-bedroom 4-person flat)	7 sqm	8 sqm
08 to 10	No change		

All flats would accord with Mayoral targets for external space set out within the Housing SPG and emerging policy D6. The flats with a revised external amenity provision would continue to be below Brent targets for private space as set out within policy DMP19. While the shortfall of private space increases for two of the flats (both 1-bedroom homes), the total shortfall in private external space does not increase and the communal space is still considered to be sufficient to meet the amenity space requirements for both the existing flats within Pharamond and the proposed flats (as set out in the main report).

Other potential implications of the changes

With regard to privacy, two balconies were previously proposed within the eastern façade, with both balconies being less than 9 m from the boundary. There are still two balconies proposed within the eastern façade, but both are a minimum of 9 m from the boundary, according with SPD1 in terms of privacy and overlooking.

One balcony was proposed in the northern façade that was less than 9 m from the boundary. No projecting balconies are proposed within the northern façade, and the roof terraces on the 3rd floor are as previously proposed, situated 9 m from the boundary.

With regard to parking, the change in the housing mix would increase the Brent maximum parking standard for the development by 0.5 spaces but would not result in an increase in the emerging London Plan maximum standards. As set out in the main report, parking is anticipated at around 50 % of the maximum standards. The change in unit mix is therefore not considered to materially change the parking demand for the development.

Alterations to Conditions

Condition 2: (Approved Plans) will need to be amended to reflect the revised drawings and should now read as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

618-2b-001A,
100D,
110B,
111B,
112C,
200B,
201
300B,

301B,
900B,
WIE/SA/95/0009/A02,
0010/A02,
0011/A02
240915B
RT-MME-129209-05 Rev A

Reason: In the interests of proper planning

Condition 25 (Details of balconies) – this condition can now be removed as this matter has been addressed within the revised drawings.

Recommendation: To approve permission as set out in the main report subject to the amendments to condition 2 and removal of condition 25 as discussed above

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank