



## Supplementary - Planning Committee

**Wednesday, 16 March 2011 at 7.00 pm**

Committee Rooms 1, 2 and 3, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9HD

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

RS Patel (Chair)  
Sheth (Vice-Chair)  
Adeyeye  
Baker  
Cummins  
Daly  
Hashmi  
Kataria  
Long  
McLennan  
CJ Patel

#### First alternates

Councillors:

Kabir  
Mitchell Murray  
Hossain  
Kansagra  
Cheese  
Naheerathan  
Castle  
Oladapo  
Thomas  
J Moher  
Lorber

#### Second alternates

Councillors:

Gladbaum  
R Moher  
Mashari  
HB Patel  
Allie  
Ogunro  
Beck  
Powney  
Van Kalwala  
Moloney  
Castle

**For further information contact:** Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer  
(0200 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:

[www.brent.gov.uk/committees](http://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

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>WARD</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
16. Supplementary report		1 - 12

## Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011

Item No.

3

Case No.

10/3052

---

Location	Newfield Primary School & Newfield Nursery School, Longstone Avenue & Mission Dine Club, Fry Road, London, NW10
Description	Demolition of single storey building Mission Dine Community Centre and two temporary classrooms and the erection of a single and two storey extension to Newfield Primary school, creation of 2 external multi use games, 3 key stage playing areas and associated hard and soft landscaping

### Agenda Page Number: 17

The Borough Solicitor has made a number of comments in relation to the proposed conditions suggested to be attached to any permission.

In terms of conditions 3, 7, 8 and 9 the words "or within 3 months of the commencement of development" should be included after the words ".....of the date of this decision".

Conditions 5 and 6 deal with sustainability issues. It is suggested that the sentence "Once approved the rating should be maintained for the lifetime of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority" be attached to the end of the condition.

**Recommendation: Remains approval, subject to legal agreement, with amendments to conditions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.**

DocSuppF

## Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011

Item No.

4

Case No.

11/0208

---

Location	Woodcock Park, Shaftesbury Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0RD
Description	Installation of an artificial turf pitch with perimeter fencing on existing tarmac area of park

### Agenda Page Number: 33

Following publication of the Committee Report, the applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Method Statement in accordance with the requirements of Condition 6. The Council's Landscape Officer has reviewed the information submitted and considers that the detail provided is acceptable. As such, it is recommended that Condition 6 is amended as follows:

*6. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations set out in the Arboricultural Method Statement (Ref: LBB/WCK/AMS/01 Rev A) and root protection provided in accordance with the plan contained in Appendix 5: Tree Constraints and Protection Plan (March 2011) for the duration of the construction period unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

Page 1

*Reason: To ensure existing trees will be protected throughout the duration of the*

*construction and the protection of the pitch surface from invasive root damage*

An additional condition is proposed to secure the provision of the 6 semi-mature trees to the west of the development as detailed below:

*7. Within three months of completion of the development, full details of the provision of 6 semi-mature trees to the west of the pitch shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The trees shall be planted in accordance with the approved details within three months of the details being approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

*Any trees planted in accordance with the approved details which, within 5 years of planting are removed, dying, seriously damaged or become diseased shall be replaced in similar positions by trees and shrubs of similar species and size to those originally planted unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.*

*Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance and setting for the development and to ensure that the proposed development enhances the visual amenity of the locality and to provide tree planting in pursuance of section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.*

**Recommendation: Grant Consent**

DocSuppF

<b>Supplementary Information</b>	<b>Item No.</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011</b>	<b>Case No.</b>	10/3261

---

Location	16 Bouverie Gardens, Harrow, HA3 0RQ
Description	Demolition of existing garage and erection of part single part two storey side and rear extension and extended rear patio, replacement of existing timber windows with double glazed uPVC windows to both the front and rear elevations, rear dormer window and one roof light to both the side roofslope facing No. 14 Bouverie Gardens and rear roofslope of the dwellinghouse (revised description).

**Agenda Page Number: 47**

Following advice from the borough solicitor, it is recommended that Condition 5 is amended as follows:

*The replacement windows to the front elevation of the main house and to the front elevation of the side extension hereby approved shall **replicate the design of the original windows**, particularly in terms of the length and width of the glazing area, style, frame depth and thickness, dentil drip-rail design and thickness, externally mounted leaded-light details, proportions and sizes of upper & lower casements, the thickness of the sills, even profiles of the opening and fixed casements and even sight-lines.*

*Reason: In the interests of ensuring a high quality of design that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Mount Stewart Conservation Area.*

**Recommendation: Grant Consent**      Page 2

DocSuppF

**Supplementary Information  
Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011**

Item No.  
Case No.

**7**  
11/0082

---

Location 1A Dorchester Way, Harrow, HA3 9RF  
Description Erection of a 2 storey building comprising 3 terraced dwellinghouses, installation of hardstanding, 3 parking spaces and refuse storage to front, garden space to rear and associated landscaping to site

**Agenda Page Number: 57**

*Additional Representations*

A letter of objection has been received from 5 Dorchester Way. The concerns raised are summarised as follows:

- Loss of privacy, light and air to property;
- Insufficient on-site parking;
- Congestion resulting in pollution, noise and dust;
- Highways safety issues;
- Proposal out of keeping in the area;
- Concern that recommendation is to grant permission when it has previously been refused and appeal dismissed.

Matters relating to transportation, residential amenity and design have been assessed in the Committee Report. The Council's Transportation Officer has not raised objection regarding resultant congestion in the area and considers the on site parking provision and turning areas to be acceptable. Weight has been given to the previous appeal decisions and the Planning Inspectorates recommendation.

Thames Water have raised no objection to the proposal.

**Recommendation: Remains Approval, subject to a S106 Agreement**

DocSuppF

**Supplementary Information  
Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011**

Item No.  
Case No.

**9**  
10/3247

---

Location Cambridge Court, Cambridge Avenue, Ely Court, Chichester Road & Wells Court, Coventry Close, London, NW6  
Description Demolition of Cambridge Court, Wells Court and Ely Court and redevelopment to provide 144 residential units (86 market units - 32 one-bed, 41 two-bed, 10 three-bed and 3 four bed & 58 affordable units - 16 one-bed, 22 two-bed, 10 three-bed and 10 four-bed) in 3, 4 and 5 storey buildings. Development includes the stopping up of existing access road and the formation of a new access road from Chichester Road, alterations to car parking, open space, relocation of existing playspace adjacent to Kilburn Park underground station, new vehicular and pedestrian routes through the site and provision of private and communal gardens.

## **Agenda Page Number: 75**

### **SITE VISIT**

During the recent Committee site visit, held on Saturday 12th March 2011, clarification was sought by both Members and local residents on a number of issues. These issues are addressed below.

### **OWNERSHIP OF OPEN SPACES & ACCESSES**

At present, Alpha Place and Gorefield Place, the local access roads on the site, are estate roads and not adopted highway. As such, they are currently maintained through local service charges to tenants and leaseholders. Parking is free to residents who apply to Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) for free permits and control is maintained by a contracted clamping service who clamp cars without a permit.

All new roads to be constructed as part of the proposal will be built to adoptable standards and, with the exception of the parking bays, will be adopted as public highway by the Council following completion. As an adopted highway the maintenance charge for these new roads will pass to the Council.

The pedestrian footpaths across the site are intended to be used by local residents and are not intended as designated Public Rights of Way, although the public will have informal access. It is intended that these footpath routes will continue to have the same function and will continue to be maintained by BHP through local service charges.

At present, all amenity and landscaped areas, including the existing play area, are common to all residents and maintained by BHP through service charges to tenants and leaseholders. On the site of Cambridge and Wells Court, the proposed communal garden, located between the terrace and mews blocks facing Alpha House, is currently intended to be a shared garden for those tenants and owners in the new blocks who will maintain the garden through their service charges. The communal garden, with an area of approximately 1500m<sup>2</sup>, will be enclosed by railings, in the manner of a London square. During recent meetings between the applicant and the Alpha House residents the potential for Alpha House tenants to share this open space has been raised as possibility provided that those tenants are also willing to contribute to its upkeep through their service charge payments.

The open space in front of Gorefield House will remain as communal garden space for tenants of that block under the existing arrangements. The proposed play area will be available for use by all local residents. In terms of the existing open space in front of Canterbury Court, the proposal is to enclose the open space with railings and allow access to residents Canterbury Court, the upper floors of Ely Court and the flat iron block next to the former public house. The maintenance of this area will be paid for through the service charges of the blocks and flats using it. The existing footpath running along the south-eastern side of Alpha House will move closer to the building and it is proposed to enclose the remaining garden/landscaped section with railings and install planting to ensure privacy, particularly for ground floor residents. These arrangements would be secured by way of a planning condition.

Members are advised that the capital expenditure required for all improvements to the roads and open spaces on the site will be met by the new development and that existing residents will not be required to make any form of contribution.

## FUNDING & TENURE

The sale of the sites on the Carlton Vale roundabout (09/2500) and Albert Road (09/3319) have so far funded the acquisition of flats from existing leaseholders, the costs of bringing forward designs for the next phase of sites and the cost of demolishing existing blocks.

The sale of the application site would provide sufficient funding for both the replacement affordable housing on the subject site and the construction of the proposed affordable housing scheme on the Bond/Hicks Bolton site, for which the planning application is likely to be considered by Planning Committee in May of this year. Due to the predicted value of the proposed market housing on the subject site, the South Kilburn Regeneration Project can continue to be afforded with little or no Homes and Communities Agency grant. The Councils consultants estimate that Brent can continue to redevelop the estate using cross subsidy from market housing comfortably over the next five years even with low levels of grant available. If the current scheme were not to go ahead then it would have a direct impact on the viability of future phases of the South Kilburn Regeneration programme.

## LOSS OF AFFORDABLE UNITS

Of the existing 86 units located across the site, 60 exist as affordable units with the remaining 26 having been sold to leaseholders over the years under the Right-to-Buy scheme. The current proposal would involve the reprovision of 58 affordable units on the site, a net loss of 2 units as a direct result of this development.

However, as discussed above, if approved the proposed development would be used to provide funding for the affordable housing scheme on the Bond Hicks Bolton site, if planning permission is approved. This development would result in a net increase of 23 affordable units within the South Kilburn Area.

## PHYSICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BUILDINGS

Members sought clarification on the relationships between both the existing and proposed buildings, on the subject site, and those buildings nearby.

In terms of the relationship with Alpha House, Officers can confirm that the central and northern 3-storey blocks of Cambridge Court directly face, and are located approximately 15m from, the south eastern facade of Alpha House. The proposed mews blocks have been sited so that they only partially face the south-eastern facade of Alpha House, at either end, and where they would directly face one another, this would be at a distance of 7m. It should be noted that the mews blocks are generally two-storeys in height where they would face Alpha House. Whilst, the proposed mews block would be 8m closer to the south-eastern facade of Alpha House than the existing blocks to Cambridge Court, the siting of the proposed mews blocks, so as to limit any direct facing, would be likely to prevent unreasonable harm to the outlook from habitable room windows on the south eastern facade of Alpha House. All habitable room windows to the proposed mews blocks have been orientated in order to prevent direct overlooking of the south-eastern facade of Alpha House.

As discussed in the main report, the flank wall of Gorefield House would face the front of the link block at a distance of approximately 6m. Whilst, this would limit the outlook from some windows on the ground and first floors, given that the flank wall of Gorefield House is only 7m in width, it is not considered that this impact would be detrimental. Whilst the link block may be visible at an angle from windows to the front and rear of Gorefield House this is likely to be at a distance in excess of 10m which would be unlikely to cause significant harm to the

outlook and privacy of existing and future residents.

## CAR PARKING

Further to the main report, the Council's Transportation Unit have concluded their assessment of the car-parking provision for the development and it can be confirmed that the following arrangements would apply should the application be approved by Members.

As discussed in the main report, recent parking studies indicate that there is spare capacity to accommodate an additional 45 parked vehicles on-street within the vicinity of the site. If approved, with the exception of 43 units, the development would be subject to a 'permit-free agreement, whereby residents would not be entitled to on-street parking permits, in order to restrict the demand for the existing capacity for on-street parking to approximately one space per unit. As the spare on-street parking capacity is generally located along Chichester Road (approximately 35-40 spaces) those 43 units which will be exempt from the permit-free agreement would comprise of those within the terrace and flat iron blocks on the Ely Court site and those within the western mews block on the Cambridge/Wells site.

Car-parking for the affordable units within the proposed development and for the occupiers of the existing units within Alpha House, Gorefield House and Canterbury Court would continue to be provided on-site. As a result of the development, the on-site parking provision would be reduced by 14 spaces, from 118 to 104 spaces. However, the total number of units which would be entitled to park on the site would also be reduced by 26 and, therefore, the overall parking provision for residents of those buildings would be improved. With the exception of 10 spaces to be provided at the northern end of the site, no on-site parking would be available for occupiers of the market element of the proposed development.

## CONSULTATION

A general summary of the consultation undertaken with local residents to date has already been provided in the main report. In terms of consultation undertaken by the Council's Major Projects Team (the applicant) this primarily involved holding New Homes Public Exhibitions and a Residents Design Group. The Residents Design Group workshops were held on the 12th August, 16th September and the 11th November 2010 between 6-8pm and were attended by between 11 and 23 residents at each session. New Homes Exhibitions were held on 29th July, 30th September and the 25th November 2010 between 2-7pm, and were attended by between 20-60 residents at each event. All of the events were held at the Salvation Army in Chichester Road, in close proximity to the affected blocks, and were advertised by flyer drops to between 1000 and 2000 homes and in the Connect SK magazine which is distributed to approximately 3000 households in the South Kilburn Area. Since the application was submitted Officers from the Major Projects Team have met twice with residents of the Alpha Gorefield Residents Association in order to discuss local concerns.

A summary of the statutory consultation undertaken by the Planning Service has been set out in the main report. In addition to the consultation detailed in the main report, it should also be noted that as well as the standard procedure to make hard copy available at the One Stop Shop in Brent House, Wembley, that a hard copy was also placed at the Community Resource Centre on Albert Road in an effort to make access to hard copies more convenient for local residents. In terms of the Council's online service, Officers are aware that some residents have experience technical difficulties in viewing certain files due to their size. Where such issues have been reported and cannot be resolved, Officers have issued, on request, CDs containing the requested files. As mentioned above, Officers from the Council's Major Projects team have met with local Residents Associations in order to explain the proposals. Overall, it is considered that the Council have met the statutory requirements for consultation on the planning application.



## CONCERNS OF RESIDENTS

During the recent site visit a number of specific concerns were raised by residents. These concerns are addressed below.

Concerns were raised regarding the cumulative impact of development and specific reference was made to high speed rail proposals and future activity associated with the nearby Royal Mail Sorting Office. Members will be aware that the High Speed 2 (HS2) rail link is an underground proposal that has its own ongoing consultation. Officers are unaware of any plans or proposals involving the sorting office.

Concerns were raised regarding highway safety so far as it relates to the proposed children's play area and collection and drop off at St Mary's School. It is envisaged that only light traffic will use the new link road, which runs close to the children's playground, and that vehicles will not be able to reach high speeds as a "home zone" is being created where pedestrians will have priority. It should also be noted that the play area will be fenced and gated so that any conflict is reduced to a minimum. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposals do not attempt to solve any particular problems that may exist with drop off/collection at St Mary's School, it is also considered that the proposed development would be unlikely to make existing conditions significantly worse.

Concerns were raised regarding noise from the relocated play area. In terms of its relationship with existing residential dwellings, it should be noted that the play area will still be over 35m away from most dwellings and 20m at the narrowest point. Given, the size and type of play area proposed, it is not envisaged that excessive noise would be associated with its use.

## EMERGENCY ACCESS AND SERVICING

Further to the main report, Officers can again confirm that the proposals have been inspected by the Council's Transportation Unit who have stated that the development would provide suitable access and circulation for emergency vehicles.

In terms of servicing, the applicant has provided revised plans indicating a minor alteration to the access to the car-park at the northern end of the site. This would provide better turning facilities for refuse vehicles entering and exiting Coventry Close. As such, it is recommended that plans SK0048 and 100807-TK09 are added to condition 2 and that the following condition should be added to any permission.

"The access to the car park at the northern end of the site from Coventry Close shall be constructed in accordance with plan 100807-TK09 and SK0048 prior to occupation of any part of the northern mews block

Reason: In order to ensure the safe and convenient collection of refuse/recycling from the northern mews block"

## SUSTAINABILITY

Further drawings indicating the siting of pv panels on the roof of the development have been received from the applicant. As such, it is recommended that condition 2 should be amended to include drawings SK0047 and 2308-PL-007.

**Recommendation: Remains grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of**

## Area Planning to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor

DocSuppF

### Supplementary Information

Item No.

11

### Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011

Case No.

11/0051

---

Location	Storage Land next to 75, St Pauls Avenue, London, NW2 5TG
Description	Redevelopment of the site to provide a part 3, part 4, storey building, comprising 10 affordable units and associated access, landscaping, a disabled parking space and cycle parking provision.

### Agenda Page Number: 103

Following the writing Committee report Officers have received correspondence from solicitors on behalf of the adjacent garage requesting the Committee be postponed as a revision had been made to the plans and the site notice had not expired before the report was written.

It is clear that no decision can be made earlier than allowed and, for information, it is confirmed that all statutory consultation periods have now ended. All additional comments received summarised below. There is no basis for delaying a decision.

The revision to the area to the ground floor front of the site is discussed in the report and was not of a scale that warranted any reconsultation.

Cllr Lesley Jones has commented that the applicants' consultation process was inadequate. She acknowledges that it is a difficult site to develop, but that a reduction in scale and providing a high standard of landscape design will help enhance the currently unattractive street scene. She expresses concern about design and height. There is also concern about the new road layout and road safety particularly for cyclists

### Consultation

Following the writing of the committee report 5 further objections have been received raising the following concerns, including extensive objections from the representatives of the garage. The concerns about the "right of way" through the site that Members will be familiar with have been set out in the main body of the report:

- Concern about design, materials (brickwork and paving) and poor relationship with Kingsley Court.
- The scaled down version of the previous application has not addressed the reason for refusal on design grounds.
- The paved frontage remains and fails to respond to the character of strong building lines and green perimeters, this is exacerbated by the new road layout and increased paved footway.
- The amenity space is still located next to the right of way contrary to reason for refusal number 3 (of 10/0677).
- Reason for refusal number 7 (of 10/0677) regarding noise has not been overcome and no condition can control the activities of the garage business
- Not been adequate provision for an additional 10 households given the drainage problems.
- There should be parking space for new residents as well as for visitors. Visitors, servicing and deliveries will add to the pressure on parking locally.
- Poor siting of the disabled parking space meaning they must cross the right of access to

use it

- Work on the new road layout has began. Has the new design taken into consideration the new paved area that it will front?
- The application is a wasted opportunity to comprehensively develop an important and visually prominent brownfield site
- Yet to replace the unauthorised hoarding around the site. Need to feel confident that this will be adhered to.

### **Appeal decision**

Since the committee report was written the previous application 10/0677 has been dismissed at appeal. The decision is timely and the following points are made in light of the objections above and the comments of the planning inspector.

### **Design**

Under the previous application the proposed building was recessed at both ground and first floor with the building also projecting, above 2 storeys, across the right of access to reach the western part of the site. The strength of the front building line was of concern and the 2-storey set back was considered to result in an incongruous design. The inspector stated that the proposed scale and massing of the refused scheme related acceptably to the streetscene as would the elevational detail, but the recessed frontages to accommodate the right of way and lack of landscaping would have significant shortcomings for the character and appearance of the surroundings.

The proposed scheme differs from the refused scheme significantly. Notwithstanding the bay feature to the east the main building line is set further back in the site resulting in a more coherent building line with only the ground floor entrance recessed further in order to improve the pedestrian quality of the frontage and improve the design for the benefit of future residents.

While the expanse of hardstanding to the front, forming the right of access, cannot be reduced the footprint of the building allows much greater scope for softlandscaping as discussed in the committee report; climbing plants either side of the entrance, planters in front, a hedge at the front boundary and a comprehensive landscaping scheme for the western part of the site as no building is now proposed there. Officers will ensure through the landscaping condition that substantial planting is implemented in this area to compensate for the relative shortcomings of the frontage to the east. The inspector felt that the hedge alone (introduced at the appeal stage) would not be sufficient and Officers now consider that the other 3 elements discussed are, on balance, able to adequately provide a sufficiently green frontage.

Given the right of access a building on the site cannot achieve a front building line matching neighbouring properties while also providing safe pedestrian space and landscaping. However an improved entrance feature is proposed by this scheme and officers consider that the limitations of the site are acceptably addressed, on balance the form of the proposed building is considered to relate to the streetscene acceptably while maintaining pedestrian safety with a designated and defined route.

Notwithstanding the indication of materials on the plans officers will require the submission of samples of the proposed hardsurfacing material to ensure it is of good quality and appearance in this residential area, red block paving is not necessarily the most appropriate choice and the applicant is advised to consider a more traditional and subtle material. Neighbours have also expressed concern about the quality and appearance of the proposed white rockwool/rockpanel cladding, again a sample of this would be required by condition and officers will require a different material if its quality is not acceptable to ensure a high

standard of development is achieved. The case will be the same for bricks which will be expected to reflect the surrounding character.

### **New road layout**

Officers reaffirm that Highways Engineers did consider the current application with reference to the revised road layout which is being implemented. The change to the footprint of the building no longer projecting across the right of access and the designation of a pedestrian route to the entrance has removed the potential conflicts identified by the inspector. The siting of the disabled parking space is not objected to as visibility through the site is acceptable.

While the new road layout increases the depth of pavement around the site this has no bearing on the boundary of the subject site and the relationship of the proposed building to this boundary. The form of the building is considered to be acceptable in relation to neighbouring properties in combination with the landscaping proposed and this will not alter with the revised junction.

### **Noise**

The inspector found that habitable accommodation within the proposed development could be reasonably protected from the garage noise by design and glazing as could balconies by some kind of screening, but the external amenity space would be exposed to high noise levels. It is noted that the garage noise impact might become acceptable if the outside space adjoining the appeal site were not used but this is subject to other proceedings and cannot be controlled by planning condition. As noted in the committee report acoustic fencing will be required and this can be enhanced by trees/large planting along the western boundary of the amenity space to significantly mitigate the noise but with the use of the garage as it currently stands it must be acknowledged that the amenity space would still be exposed to high noise levels at times. However in summary the inspector states that it is unlikely that any of the identified shortcomings alone would have been sufficient to result in dismissal of the previous appeal. Officers are clear that the other issues have been addressed and noise to the amenity space should not stand as a sole reason for refusal to an otherwise acceptable development.

### **Flooding**

The inspector stated that if he had been in a position to approve the appeal there may have been reluctance without conditions to secure appropriate mitigation measures. A condition, as suggested by Thames Water is recommended will need to be addressed by the applicant before work commences.

### **Revised plans**

At the time of writing the committee report the set back at the entrance and introduction of planters within the pedestrian frontage was shown only on the ground floor plan, the alteration is now reflected on other plans as necessary.

GHG/813/OD21 D  
GHG/813/OD22 E  
GHG/813/OD23 B  
GHG/813/OD30 B

**Recommendation:** Remains approval subject to legal agreement and revised plans

---

Location	29, 30, 31 Brook Avenue, Wembley, HA9
Description	Demolition of 29 to 31 Brook Avenue and erection of a part 5-, 6- and 7-storey building, comprising 33 flats (11 one-bedroom, 19 two-bedroom and 3 three-bedroom), with associated landscaping, children's play area and provision of 4 disabled car-parking spaces

**Agenda Page Number: 115**

At committee site visit Members asked that the following issues be addressed:

- **Affordable housing.** Officers do not agree with elements of the Assessment but consider that the best approach is to delay the assessment until Practical Completion of the development. Then the applicants will be required to submit an affordable housing toolkit with the actual build costs and sales values. It is possible that this may yield a larger value by allowing this delay, rather than requiring the amount to be agreed now.
- **Disabled bays.** There is provision for 4 parking spaces in front of the development. Officers will require that they be marked up and laid out in accordance with approved details under new condition 22. This assigns the spaces to the accessible units in the development
- **Noise from the air conditioning units** The applicants have submitted an agreed Acoustic Report that considered the impacts of external noise sources such as the railway line, (which would be higher than the levels arising than from the air conditioning units.) The Council's Environmental Health Officers consider that with specialist glazing and ventilation methodologies on the northern elevation (facing the railway land) appropriate internal levels may be achieved. This is subject to condition 14.
- **Bin store location.** This is accessible, appropriately sized and within the 10m carry distances for collection by Council operatives
- **Wealdstone Brook Ecology.** This has been considered by an appointed ecologist. No building will be close to the brook, and the area by the stream will be appropriately landscaped under condition 10 in accordance with the ecologist's findings, to provide a buffer, with a communal amenity area further away, and any external lights will be restricted by condition 21.
- **Landscaping.** There are four trees on site, an apple, horse-chestnut, field maple and sycamore. They are located towards the rear of the site and will be retained, with protection measures agreed by the Council's Tree Officer. The shrubs/ overgrown area currently on site are not statutorily protected and will be removed as a result of the levels changes arising from the proposal, those in the neighbouring garden, number 28 are not expected to be affected and a condition requires that the landscaping along this western boundary be maintained wherever possible
- **Contamination.** The area does not have an industrial past. However, elevated contamination levels were found on 25 Brook Avenue recently, and therefore in accordance with PPS23 guidelines officers have recommended a remediation condition to ensure that it is suitable for a sensitive end-users such as the residential flats proposed.
- Details of the entrance canopy/ porch shall be specified by condition as officers feel that the proposed design could be improved.

**S106 changes**

The site lies within Wembley Growth Area but is only achieving Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH)3 because of viability. Officers have requested that they achieve specific points in the

pre-assessment to achieve 3 plus. This will be specified under s106(d)

The applicants have confirmed that they will be installing green roofs on all exposed flat roofs where no PV panels are proposed.

### **Revised drawings**

These depict the bin store and ground floor flat window pushed forward into the previous porch area, which is considered an improved outlook for the unit, and more accessible for the bin store.

Revised drawing numbers:  
PA100B; PA110B; PA300C

On advice from the Borough Solicitor: Deletion of duplicate condition 9, and addition of maintenance plan for the playspace

### **Recommendation: Grant consent subject to s106 and conditions**

DocSuppF

<b>Supplementary Information</b>	<b>Item No.</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Planning Committee on 16 March, 2011</b>	<b>Case No.</b>	10/2075

---

Location	Land next to 10, Tillett Close, London, NW10
Description	Construction of 5 dwellinghouses on hardsurfaced area of Public Open Space with associated landscaping, car-parking and refuse and cycle storage

### **Agenda Page Number: 137**

Revised drawings have been received that reflect the amendments discussed within the Committee report. This involves the re-siting of the eastern-most proposed unit so that it complies with the 1:2 guidance as set out within Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 17. Your officers consider that the submitted amendments are acceptable.

An addendum to the Design and Access statement has also been received which discusses the changes to the scheme.

### **Recommendation: Remains approval**

Revised drawings and documents: A2204 200 Rev P9, A2204 201 Rev P9, A2204 202 Rev P9, A2204 203 Rev P9, A2204 402 Rev P1, Addendum Tillett Close dated March 2011

DocSuppF