



Supplementary - Planning Committee

Wednesday 16 January 2013 at 7.00 pm

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

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Ketan Sheth (Chair)
Daly (Vice-Chair)
Aden
Baker
Cummins
Hashmi
John
CJ Patel
RS Patel
Krupa Sheth
Singh

first alternates

Councillors:

Thomas
Long
J Moher
Kansagra
Ms Shaw
Cheese
Van Kalwala
Hopkins
Gladbaum
Oladapo
Hossain

second alternates

Councillors:

R Moher
Naheerathan
Moloney
HB Patel
Sneddon
Beck
Ogunro
Lorber
Harrison
Powney
Mashari

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer
020 8937 1354, 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

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 - 6 |

Agenda Item 10

Agenda Item 03

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 16 January, 2013

Case No.

12/3022

Location 10 Rushout Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0AR
 Description Demolition of detached garage and erection of a four storey four bedroom dwellinghouse including basement, formation of 1 off street parking space and associated landscaping in accordance with revised plans received 15/01/2013 and 03/01/2013.

Agenda Page Number: 11

Revised plans have been received to correct and amend the proposed roof overhang to accord with submitted elevation plans. It is recommended Condition 2 is updated to reflect revised plan Nos. RA10A-1001D and RA10A-1002D, received 15/01/2013.

For information, in reference to the site plan in the Committee Report, the subject site and No. 10 Rushout Avenue have been separated and therefore encompasses the land only to the south of the garage, extending the whole depth of the garden.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the satisfactory completion of a S106 legal agreement.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 16 January, 2013

Case No.

12/2920

Location 141-153 High Street, London
 Description Erection of 3 storey building to provide 13 affordable flats, consisting of 4 one-bedroom, 7 two-bedroom and 2 three-bedroom units.

Agenda Page Number: 23 - 34

Sustainability

The main report to Members indicates that they will be updated on sustainability matters at the meeting.

The overall CO2 reduction from the base level of 51% substantially exceeds the London Plan policy requirement of a minimum 25% reduction. Although only 16% of this is achieved by renewables, and there is a presumption in the London Plan that this should be 20% where feasible, owing to the significant overall reduction achieved and the limits on the level of pv that can be achieved, on balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Accordingly the Heads of Term's shall be amended to:

- 51% CO2 emissions reduction over TER (2010 Building Regulations).
- Offset 16% of the site's carbon emissions through onsite renewable generation. If proven to the Council's satisfaction that it's unfeasible, provide it off site through an in-lieu payment to the council who will provide that level of offset renewable generation.

Amendments

Members visited the site on Saturday 12 January 2013. At that visit a representative of the Residents Association, whilst acknowledging how far things had moved on since the last appeal scheme, provided a list of matters of detail that they wished to be resolved in advance of the meeting.

The agent has submitted amended drawings which respond to these detailed points and these need to be referred to in the decision notice. The amended plans raise no new issues for other parties and the Residents Association have confirmed that they deal with their queries.

Recommendation: Remains grant subject to revised Heads of Terms's relating to Sustainability and revised plan numbers

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 January, 2013

Case No.

12/3026

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Location | Land next to Stonebridge Park Hotel, Hillside, Stonebridge, London |
| Description | Redevelopment of site to provide 117 dwellings comprising 1 studio flat, 41 one-bedroom flats, 51 two-bedroom flats, 8 three-bedroom flats, 12 three-bedroom houses and 4 three-bedroom duplex maisonettes within 1- to 9-storey buildings and associated works including basement (incorporating plant and car park), new access pedestrian and vehicle accesses, amenity space, reconfiguration and works to existing canal feeder, public realm and other ancillary development. |

Agenda Page Number: 35

Concerns raised by residents at the Committee site visit

The land was never allocated for housing in the original or subsequent masterplans

The original masterplan identified Site 10 for the provision of homes on the majority of the site with a combination of shops and retail on the smaller element that fronted Hillside. This was revised in 2001 when the shops were removed. Site 10 was not allocated for open space or community uses. The Orange Tree Public House element of the site was not in the original Masterplan as it was not owned by the Housing Action Trust at the time.

There are less community buildings now within Stonebridge than existed prior to its regeneration.

Information regarding the floorspace of community buildings within the 1960s Stonebridge Estate is not easily accessible by your officers. Nevertheless, the requirements for the provision of new and improved community facilities were set out within conditions and the Section 106 legal agreement of the original Stonebridge Regeneration consent. This required the provision of the community and health facilities and the community hall within 18 months of the occupation of the 1300th residential unit. The new and improved facilities have been delivered within the Hillside Hub which adjoins the application site, including a community hall, PCT Health Clinic and a variety of community rooms. A nursery was also delivered on the land to the north of the application site (the Fawood Nursery).

There is not enough public open space within the estate – particularly children's play space.

The provision of public open space followed a planned approach which looked to ensure that homes were no more than 400 m from one of the parks. A number of different open spaces have been delivered or improved, including the two parks (one north and one south of Hillside), the improvement of the Stonebridge Recreation Ground and many smaller elements of open space such as the land surrounding the Canal Feeder to the north-west and south of the application site. The amount of open space has decreased as a result of the regeneration of Stonebridge. However, this was a necessity given the decision to remove the high-rise tower blocks and provide the majority of homes as houses with front doors facing streets and private gardens.

With regard to Children's play space with dedicated play equipment, these are located to the north-west of the application site adjacent to Wood Road and the Canal Feeder and within the southern park, adjoining Lawrence Avenue. Play equipment is also proposed within this development, with that play equipment being publicly accessible. The open spaces have been handed over to the Council following their completion and Section 106 contributions will be secured as a part of this consent. Should the Council wish, more play equipment could be delivered within the open spaces funded by the Section 106 contributions for the development.

The proposed development is 'segregated' from the rest of the estate.

This matter was discussed in detail in the Committee Report. The application site is more accessible to the general public (and considerably less 'segregated') than most if not all other blocks that have been delivered to date within Stonebridge. Public access is provided along the north-south pedestrian access through the site and along the mews street. As such, the proposed development is not considered to be segregated from the rest of the estate.

The height exceeds the limit imposed by the original masterplan.

The height of the 'Rotunda' and the 'Villa Blocks' is greater than that set out within the Outline Consent (4-storeys) as discussed within the Committee Report. Several other blocks have come forward at heights that exceed this level. However, separate consent has been sought for those developments so that they can be considered on their merit. The sites that have come forward include the Hillside Hub (up to 6-storeys), Site 22 (the building opposite the Hillside hub, up to 7-storeys), Site 4 (to the north of the application site, also adjoining the park, up to 6-storeys) and site 28 (up to 5-storeys). The reasons why the proposed height of these buildings is considered acceptable is discussed in detail in the Committee Report.

Disabled parking

Disabled parking is to be provided within the new on-street parking spaces when required. The streets are to be offered to the Council for adoption. As such, the Council can control the provision of disabled bays through the standard process whereby bays are marked out on the street by the Council.

Daylight/sunlight impact of the building

This is discussed in detail below ("addendum to daylight/sunlight report")

Historical Stonebridge Masterplans

Plans have been attached showing the original (1997) Stonebridge Masterplan, the

Other matters**Ventilation plant**

The applicant has submitted confirmation that the ventilation plant will be situated internally within the building and that it will meet the standards for noise recommended by Safer Streets (10 dB below background noise levels).

Additional parking spaces (4)

A revised ground floor plan has been submitted which provides an additional 4 parking spaces within the Wood Road frontage (adjacent to the Canal Feeder) as requested by Highways. Highways have confirmed that they consider the revised layout to be acceptable.

Amendment to Condition 15

The agents have queried the specification of the boilers referred to in condition No. 15 which requires boilers to have NOx emissions that are below 20mg/kWh. They believe that it is difficult to source combi-boilers which achieve these levels at present and other types of boilers (e.g. system boilers) would require design changes to accommodate tanks and flues. Your officers accordingly recommend that this condition is amended to allow the approval of different NOx levels in the future if the Council considers that this is reasonable.

Air quality for units near to Hillside

The committee report referred to queries from Safer Streets about regarding the measures to ensure that future residents of the units near to Hillside enjoyed appropriate levels of air quality. The applicant has confirmed that the air intake vents for the whole unit ventilation systems will be situated at high level and sufficiently away from Hillside. Details of the ventilation plant are required through condition 18 and it is recommended that this condition is amended to specifically refer to ducts and flues. An additional condition is also required which specifies that the windows within the Hillside frontage are fixed closed unless otherwise agreed by the Council. This will ensure that the air to those rooms is provided by the ventilation systems and remains of adequate quality.

Addendum to daylight report – impact on nearby units

The addendum has been received which looks at the potential impact of the scheme on the adjacent units and the park. The report sets out that the scheme complies with BRE Guidance for Sunlight and Daylight with respect to the potential impact on the nearby residential units and the open space. It also compares the current proposal with the extant consent. It sets out that with regard to sunlight received by the windows of adjacent units, the proposal will be between 10 % and 41 % better than the extant consent (which also complied with BRE Guidance levels). With regard to daylight, the proposal complies with the guidance, one window is 4 % worse within the current scheme, there is no change for another and the remainder of windows enjoy greater levels of daylight. The proposal is accordingly considered acceptable with regard to the potential impact on Daylight and Sunlight.

Triggers for the approval of details

The applicant has indicated that they may need to make a start on site soon in order to secure funding for the development. They have also specified that works on the foundations and superstructure of the buildings will take place some time after the ground works commence due to the extent of the ground works that are required. As such, they have requested that some of the triggers are amended to allow further time for the submission and approval of details. While your officers would typically require the majority of details to be approved prior to commencement, in this instance it is considered acceptable to change the commencement trigger to the piling of foundations (e.g. conditions 10, 22), commencement of works on the superstructure (e.g. conditions 7, 8, 11, 12, 20 and 21), installation (e.g. condition 18) and first occupation (e.g. condition 9).

Request for S106 contributions from the NHS Brent and Harrow

A letter has been received from the NHS setting out that the Brent PCT would like to apply for £792,087 to support the healthcare services required by the additional population this development delivers. This would work out to be approximately £6,700 per unit. The NHS has attached a printout from their HUDU model which was used to calculate this amount. Where Section 106 contributions are sought, they must be required to mitigate against the impacts of the development. Whilst calculations have been provided, no evidence has been provided regarding local supply. With a new PCT clinic adjacent to the site and a relatively recently redeveloped Central Middlesex Hospital, insufficient evidence has been presented at this point of time to secure contributions towards healthcare from this development, particular at a scale that is in excess of the Section 106 standard charge for education, sustainable transport, open space and sports (combined). A meeting to discuss Section 106 and CIL requirements will be set up with the NHS to establish whether contributions should be sought in the future.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to Section 106 agreement and revised conditions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21 and 22; Additional condition regarding non-openable windows in the Hillside frontage. Revised drawing: STB10_P_110 Rev C GA Ground Floor Plan, Daylight Sunlight Assessment Addendum dated 11 January 2013

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 06

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 16 January, 2013

Case No.

12/2862

Location Former Guinness Brewery Site, Rainsford Road, Park Royal, NW10
Description Hybrid planning application comprising:

Full planning application for Plot 1 for the erection of 3 buildings providing a total of 14,704sq.m. (GEA) of B1c, B2 and B8 floorspace, including a new access onto Cumberland Avenue and associated car parking, landscaping and ancillary works.

Outline application for Plot 2 for the development of up to 28,111 sq.m. (GEA) of B1c, B2 and B8 floorspace with all matters reserved except the first phase of landscaping.

Agenda Page Number:57

GLA Stage 1 response

Officers are still awaiting the GLA's Stage 1 response which has been delayed. A provisional response was received on the 4th January stating that the GLA didn't have significant issues with the application other than that may have some minor points about the energy strategy. Although this is only a provisional response members are asked to delegate the final decision to approve the scheme to the Head of Area planning provided that the GLA's stage I and II responses do not require any significant changes to the scheme.

Amendments to Units 3, 4, and 6

As stated in the main committee report the scheme as originally submitted failed the SPG17 45 degree guidelines in respect of the relationship of Units 4 & 3 to the rear gardens of houses located in Abbeyfields Close and Moyne Close.

Page 4

The finished floor levels of both Units 3 & 4 have been reduced by 1m. The heights of Units 3 and 4 from

finished floor level to the top of the building have been reduced by 1m by removing the parapet along the north western boundary giving both units a building height of 14m from finished floor level . The overall reduction in building height for Units 3 and 4 from the original proposal is 2m.

Both Units 3 & Unit 4 still fail the 45 degree guidance but only marginally more so than the current permission. In the existing permission approved last year the failure to fully comply with the SPG17 45 degree test was justified on the basis that the failure was only marginal and that the significant landscaped buffer with a minimum depth of 11 metres and the length of the rear gardens affected sufficiently mitigated the impact of the new building. This is still considered to be the case with the amended current scheme.

For consistency if design Unit 6 has also had its height reduced even though as originally submitted this unit always complied with the 45 degree guidance.

Highways & Transportation Comments

No objection subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

1. An amended Framework Travel Plan of sufficient quality to score a PASS rating using TfL's ATTrBuTE software (or any replacement thereof) (this a revised wording to the existing travel plan clause suggested in the s106 notes); and
2. the removal of all redundant vehicular accesses to the site from Rainsford Road and reinstatement to footway at the developer's expense prior to occupation of the development through an agreement under S278 of the Highways Act 1980

Transportation have also suggested conditions to secure the following:

- (i) pedestrian routes into and through the site, including the widening of the footway to the front of Unit 6 to a minimum of 2m and the provision of pedestrian links directly into Units 1 and 2 from Rainsford Road and between Lakeside Drive and the site in the vicinity of Units 1 and 6;
- (ii) bicycle parking provision;
- (iii) the siting of any gates/barriers at the gatehouse entrance to the site;
- (iv) surface water collection at the boundary with the public highway; and
- (v) average and minimum illuminance levels for the car parks and service yards,

Recommendation:

Grant planning permission subject to the agreement of the Mayor for London and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal Services and Procurement.

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank