



Supplementary - Planning Committee

Wednesday, 18 January 2012 at 7.00 pm

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

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Sheth (Chair)
Daly (Vice-Chair)
Baker
Cummins
Hashmi
Kabir
McLennan
Mitchell Murray
CJ Patel
RS Patel
Singh

first alternates

Councillors:

Thomas
Long
Kansagra
Cheese
Castle
Oladapo
J Moher
Van Kalwala
Lorber
Gladbaum
Hossain

second alternates

Councillors:

R Moher
Naheerathan
HB Patel
Allie
Beck
Powney
Moloney
Butt
Castle
Harrison
Mashari

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services 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:

www.brent.gov.uk/committees

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 5.30pm in Committee Room 4

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
10. Supplementary		1 - 4

Agenda Item 10

Agenda Item 03

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 18 January, 2012

Case No. 11/2665

Location	113 Bryan Avenue, London, NW10 2AS
Description	Demolition of existing warehouse building and erection of four 5 bedroomed terraced dwellinghouses.

Agenda Page Number: 17

Members visited the site on Saturday 14th January 2012. At the visit a number of issues were raised which were essentially the same as those set down in the main body of the Committee report.

Main issues emphasised by residents were:

- Car parking problems. Where will people park?
- The site would be too cramped.
- Concern about quality of architecture.
- The development would be out of character with the area. There are no terraces and no 5 bedroom properties in the Dobree Estate.

In terms of the design and appearance of the development, as explained in the report, Officers consider that whilst the development is different to what is around this does not make it unacceptable. Furthermore, the fact that the proposal seeks to replace the existing unattractive warehouse building needs to be taken into consideration when it comes to deciding whether, or not, the new building will enhance the area.

As explained on the site visit, the proposal is for a contemporary interpretation of a terrace which, in the view of Officers, is likely to be more successful than if an attempt was made to copy the existing semi-detached buildings found in Bryan Avenue.

In terms of car parking, as explained in the main body of the report this is a key consideration. Officers consider that although, again as set down in the report, the parking requirements will increase between the existing warehouse use and the proposed houses, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate that increase on-street. This view takes account of existing parking conditions in the vicinity, the making good of the existing crossover (which would increase on-street provision at the developers expense) and the removal of any demand for any servicing vehicles to visit the site, which would be the case in the event that the existing warehouse building were to be brought back into use as a lawful B8 use.

An 87 signature petition objecting to the proposal was received by the Council on 17 January 2012. It calls on Councillors to refuse the planning application. No additional issues are raised by the petition.

Recommendation: Remains approval, subject to Section 106 legal agreement.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 18 January, 2012

Case No. 11/2795

Location	165 Edgware Road, Kingsbury, London, NW9 6LL
Description	Change of use from Off Licence shop (Use Class A1) to Slot Machine Arcade (Sui Generis)

Agenda Page Number: 31

Correspondence has been received from the Fryent Ward Councillors raising concern that the application may further contribute to anti-social behaviour and environmental issues in the area.

As set out in the Committee Report, there is no evidence to indicate that users of an amusement centre would be a threat to safety and security or cause anti-social behaviour. Unless there is demonstrable harm, refusal on these grounds could not be sustained.

Recommendation: Remains Grant Consent

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 06

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 18 January, 2012

Case No. 11/2635

Location	Central Square, Wembley, HA9
Description	Erection of a new 5 storey block incorporating a retained station ticket hall and new platform access corridor 2729 sqm of new retail floor space, an 86 bedroom hotel including a bar and restaurant and 38 new residential flats. This is a replacement scheme for 'Building 2' of the original planning permission for the redevelopment of Central Square granted on the 13/10/2005 (reference 03/3765).

Agenda Page Number: 53

Members visited this site on Saturday and raised the following issues:

The existing Council tower blocks (Manor and Lodge Court) should have their exteriors refurbished by the developer. These two buildings were never part of the planning permission to redevelop Central Square and fall outside the scope of this revised proposal. The buildings have been extensively refurbished in the last ten years including the installation of new windows. Any meaningful improvement to these buildings exteriors would probably require external cladding which would be too great an expense for this development to bear alone. While s106 money could contribute to their refurbishment it would be at the expense of other spending commitments.

Clarify the height of building 2 compared to the rear portion of building 1.

Building 2 is five storeys high, a storey lower than the rear portion of Building 1 which is six storeys.

Could building 2 be higher? Perhaps as high as the tower of building 1? The rationale behind the massing of the scheme was for the tower of Building 1 to be the focal point of the development with a group of smaller subservient buildings clustered around it. Any significant increase in the height of Building 2 would have an overbearing impact on the public spaces around it. There may also be a practical limit on the amount of

development that can be built over the station deck

Recommendation: Grant consent.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 07

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 18 January, 2012

Case No.

11/3054

Location	RE-DEVELOPMENT, STONEBRIDGE ESTATE, Stonebridge Estate, London, NW10
Description	Extension to time limit of outline planning permission 07/3309 dated 02/12/08 for outline application for the demolition of Gardiner Court, Brett Crescent, NW10, and the erection of 3 buildings comprising 122 self-contained flats, comprising 3 x studio units, 63 x 1-bedroom units, 45 x 2-bedroom units and 11 x 3-bedroom units, formation of new vehicular access, pedestrian access and associated landscaping (matters to be determined: layout, scale & access) as accompanied by Urban Design Code, Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement dated 23 August 2007, Design and Access statement and Analysis of Daylight and Sunlight for the proposed Stonebridge Development Part 1, dated 25th October 2007 and subject to a Deed of Agreement dated 2nd December 2008 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

Agenda Page Number: 71

Revised Energy Statement

The revised Energy Statement has now been received which sets out the predicted baseline CO₂ demand for the site and reductions associated with the “Be Lean”, “Be Clean” and “Be Green” measures including the Mayor’s target to achieve a 20 % reduction in CO₂ through “on-site renewables”.

The statement sets out the proposed “Be Lean” measures which include U-values significantly below Building Regulations together with other measures to achieve the reductions in predicted CO₂ demand. These measures achieve a 38 % reduction from the specified Total CO₂ emissions for the “baseline building” (Building Regulations 2010 compliant). However, it is not clear whether this includes both regulated and unregulated CO₂. Nevertheless, the applicant also specified that the development will achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for which mandatory credit 1 also requires a 25 % reduction in CO₂ from 2010 Building Regulations Target Emissions Rate. As such, your officers consider that the further detail that is required to demonstrate compliance with this part of the London Plan Policy can be secured through the “Sustainability Implementation Strategy”.

With regard to the “Be Clean” measures, the statement sets out that the incorporation of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) will help the development to achieve the required reductions in CO₂, but that the target levels can be achieved through the incorporation of either CHP or the proposed “Be Green” measures (Photovoltaic (PV) Panels). The statement does not commit to the use of CHP or PV Panels, but rather specifies that the target levels can be achieved using either of these technologies and that the final design of the development itself will inform the end energy strategy. Whilst your officers would typically secure the actual measures within Outline Consents, your officers consider that it is acceptable to secure the final measures through the Sustainability Implementation Strategy in this instance and given that this is a renewal of a planning consent that is committing to a Code for Sustainable Homes Level that is higher than that required by Planning Policy. However, the applicant should be aware that the London Plan currently requires the inclusion of CHP unless it is not feasible.

Comments from Legal Services:

- There is no need for a new full Section 106 agreement. An amended Section 106 agreement referring to the extension of time and any other changes is required.
- Conditions 6 and 7 should be amended to include “permanently retained unless otherwise agreed”.

Recommendation:

Remains grant consent subject to a revised Section 106 Legal Agreement and amendments to Conditions 6 and 7.

This page is intentionally left blank