



## Supplementary Planning Committee

**Tuesday 13 January 2015 at 7.00 pm**

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

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)  
Colacicco (Vice-Chair)  
Agha  
S Choudhary  
Filson  
Hylton  
Kansagra  
Mahmood

#### Substitute Members

Councillors:

Chohan, A Choudry, Conneely, Duffy,  
Ezeajughi, W Mitchell Murray and M Patel

Councillors

Colwill

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

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

**[democracy.brent.gov.uk](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)**

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

**Members' briefing will take place at 6.15pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8**

# Agenda

10. Supplementary

1 - 10

# Agenda Item 10

## Agenda Item 03

### Supplementary Information

### Planning Committee on 13 January, 2015

Case No.

14/4208

Location	Bowling Club and Collins Lodge, King Edward VII Park, Park Lane, Wembley
Description	Change of use of the bowling pavillion and adjoining land (Use class D2) into a primary school (Use class D1) also including the erection of a single storey classroom block, and part change of use of the land adjoining Collins Lodge (Use class C3) into parkland (Use class D2)

#### Agenda Page Number: 5

#### Members Site Visit

Members of the Planning Committee visited the site on Saturday 10 January 2015. The following clarification is provided:

#### ***Use of wider park (in particular former bowling green) by school***

As discussed in paragraph 10 within the main committee report, the former bowling green will still be managed by Brent's Sports and Parks Service with the intention to maintain the former bowling green as a grassed area of public open space. The Sports and Parks Service are considering whether this area, or part of the area, could be booked by local groups such as Park Lane Primary School, nursery groups, the Welsh School. This would provide an additional external play area for the Welsh School to that as shown within the application site, possibly for around 1.5 to 2 hours a day. It should be noted that this application does not secure the use of any additional space as this would be subject to separate agreement with Sports and Parks Service. The application has been submitted on the basis that the site, as shown within the application submission, is of a sufficient size to accommodate the school.

#### **Consultation**

Reference has been made to a letter of support being registered to the incorrect address. To clarify, a letter of support was received from 23 Toley Avenue. The letter was incorrectly registered to the wrong address 28 Princes Court when it received by the Council. This administrative error was rectified with appropriate letter sent to 23 Toley Avenue providing detail of the Planning Committee meeting and site visit. There has been no letter of support received from 28 Princes Court or letter purporting to be from this address.

A number of additional representations have been received since the main Planning Committee report was published. These are discussed in further detail below. When such representations are received by email/hard copies only the address is provided on the Council's website unlike when applications are submitted online; a copy of the email/letter can be viewed by the public if requested.

Concerns have also been raised with potential false addresses being provided by those wishing to support the planning application. Your officers can confirm that a total of 7 representations (of a total of 27) supporting the application have been received by residents in Brent, and that it has been verified that the names provided are connected to the relevant addresses. A number of the other representations have been received from outside the Borough. Whilst officers have not been able to verify these addresses, given the specialist nature of the Welsh School, it is not considered unrealistic that representations from outside the Borough could be provided. There is no evidence to suggest that false details have been provided.

#### **Ownership of application site**

Property and Asset Management have confirmed that the site would remain in the ownership of the Council. Should the proposal be granted planning permission, an agreement would be put in place for the Welsh School would manage the buildings and a lease entered into (provisionally for 15 years).

#### **Possible alternative site for land swap or school - Collins Lodge and land adjacent to Collins Lodge**

Collins Lodge was considered by the Welsh School when they were considering potential sites for the school. This site was discounted as it was not considered **Page 1** the existing building would be appropriate to accommodate the school. Furthermore, given the prominent location in the park, it is considered unlikely that

significant extensions or a further building would be appropriate.

With regard to the site adjacent to Collins Lodge, this is allocated within the agreement with Veolia as a depot site and as such is not available.

### ***Use of car park within King Edward VII Park***

Whilst the planning application does not propose any car parking, the Council's Sports and Parks Services have advised that they are willing in principle for the school to use the car park in the south west corner of the park accessed via St John's Road.. The school would need to be fully responsible for opening and closing the gates to the car park and that they remain closed when they are not in use and monitored / managed by the school even for the short period of time when they are open. This use/management of the car park could be secured as part of the School Travel Plan.

However, it should be noted that given the size and location of the proposed school, it is not considered to detrimentally impact on the surrounding road network and is acceptable without parking provided. This has been discussed in paragraphs 26 to 30 of the main Committee Report.

### **Additional representations received**

The following comments have been raised by Councillor Stopp:

- Queried whether providing the school on the green space is the best use of the land;

The school building will not be built on the "green space" and involves the reuse of the site of the bowling club which falls within a D2 use. The former bowling club green does not form part of the planning application and its future use is discussed in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the main committee report

- Concerns with increase in parking congestion and noise.

These matters have been considered as part of paragraphs of the main committee report. A condition is recommended to restrict the opening hours of the school.

- Loss of community facility

#### *Further comments/objections*

9 further objections have been received. These are considered below:

- Loss of Welsh School consequence of expansion at Stonebridge Primary School – potential to explore sharing this site;

Each application is assessed on its individual merits. The justification for this proposal is set out in the Planning Committee report.

- Security fears over isolation of site – previous concern with nursery at Park Lane Primary School;

The building was previously in use and there is no reason to suggest that with normal supervision that this location for a school would give rise to security concerns. Sports and Parks Services have advised that, subject to Section 106 funding being agreed, a landscape design for the former bowling green could potentially include removing the fence but retaining some of the hedge so that the bowling green is brought back into the open space but that we do not lose the biodiversity value of the hedge.

- Potential disputes between Parks and school regarding maintenance of paths;

The lease agreement will cover the terms of the use/access between the Council and the leasee (the Welsh School)

- Arrangements for deliveries and waste impractical;

Arrangements regarding servicing are set out in the Committee Report (paragraphs 32 and 33)

- Emergency access;

In terms of emergency access, Sports and Parks Service have advised that there are three entrances the park that would be used, principally using the entrance from Park Lane. All the gates have fire service locks on them

so they can be opened by the fire service. The other entrances are off St Johns Road and The Dene. These are the entrances would be used if there was a fire in the changing rooms/pavilion for example.

- Yard next to Collins Lodge to be considered for land swap;

Please refer to comments provided above.

- Funding of school;

The justification for this proposal is set out in the Planning Committee report.

- Precedent for building on parks;

The justification for this proposal is set out in the Planning Committee.

- Area of park annexed by Park Lane School

Officers can advise that the school were initially given use of the area during curriculum time at a period in time when schools were being encouraged to use park space to encourage people to be active and make greater use of the outdoors. Originally it is believed that outside of curriculum time the area was supposed to be available for use by the public however it would seem that over time the school has developed exclusive use of this area.

- Use of the car park within the park and safety issues with general public access to the former bowling green

This application must be considered on its own merits. There is no reason to suggest that with normal supervision that the location would give rise to security concerns. The Council often have requests to use areas of open space that aren't formal pitches either for one off activity or on a regular basis. When the Council receives a request, a permit is issued as this would provide evidence to the wardens or anyone else that the group has the councils permission to use that space.

- School is not a charity but a Private Fee paying school and will not enhance the use of the park for local residents, if anything it will have a detrimental impact on regular users by fencing, CCTV, additional Lighting and people wishing to freely exercise their dogs.

Full details of lighting will be conditioned to any forthcoming consent. The former bowling green and pavilion is already fenced off from the main park, and this proposal is seeking to include the former bowling green as a grassed area for public open space. In terms of the management such as areas where dogs are permitted, this will be subject to the agreement of the Council's Parks Services.

**Sport England** - concerned regarding the ongoing use of the bowling green and clarity around its future status. Sport England advise they would support the ongoing use of the application site for sports and that strictly speaking, the application does not demonstrate full conformity with para 74 of the NPPF:

*Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:*

- *an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
- *the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
- *the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.*

Whilst Sport England does not dispute that the Bowls Club disbanded in 2013, this in itself does not mean that the site has no future purpose in serving the ongoing strategic needs of the bowls community. Sport England would advocate that the site remain in sporting use and that other sporting uses should be considered ahead of non sporting uses.

In response, the Sports and Parks service have confirmed the following:

*They supported Brent's bowls clubs for several years to try and help them extend their membership however across the board membership of bowls clubs is falling and aging. The fact that Brent has a considerably young population may be one of the factors as bowls tends to be an older persons sport.*

King Edwards park already has the following sports facilities:

- Hard court tennis courts
- Outdoor gym
- Multi Use Games Area
- Football pitches and we are planning to provide a cricket wicket.

There are no other sports facilities that we could be provided on the bowling green site that aren't already provided within the park. Sports and Parks will not be maintaining the bowling green.

There is already a large block of changing rooms / pavilion within the park that serves the pitches and the longer term aim using external and capital money is to re-provide these facilities within the existing footprint so that they are more up to date and fit for purpose. The bowls pavilion does not have the facilities required for the pitches nor is it appropriately located to serve the other sports facilities in the park.

*Representations supporting the application*

27 representations have been received from individual properties supporting the application. These comments make reference to the importance of the Welsh School as an educational, cultural and community asset, and how the loss of the Welsh School operating in Brent would be a threat to the continued use of the Welsh language. The historical reference to the Welsh School operating in Brent since the 1950s was also raised.

The above matters have been referred to within the main committee report as part of paragraphs 6 to 8.

**Recommendation: Remain approval subject to conditions set out after paragraph 38 of the main Committee Report.**

DocSuppF

## Agenda Item 04

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 13 January, 2015

Case No.

14/4508

---

Location	Northwick Park Hospital, Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3UJ
Description	Erection of part 4 to 5 storey building constructed over an existing substation and car parking located near Block J, providing ward accommodation on first, second and third floors along with an IDAR Unit, plant area, with ancillary cafe on the ground floor, a linked bridge to Block E, reconfiguration of parking area and associated landscaping

#### Agenda Page Number: 17

Comments have been received from Councillor Perrin which have been circulated to the Planning Committee. Further detail and clarification is provided below:

- Consultation Process and responses

The consultation process was carried out in accordance with statutory guidelines. Site notices were also displayed adjacent to the site and the planning application publicised in the local press. In addition to the above, in accordance with the guidance set out in SPG2 "Commenting on a Planning Application" the nearby key worker accommodation at Kodak Court and Hodgson Court were consulted together with Ward Councillors, London Borough of Harrow and Sudbury Court Residents' Association.

The consultation section of the Committee Report summarises comments received from officers in Transportation, Landscape and Environmental Health departments together with comment from the Environment Agency.

- *Inaccurate plans*

Concerns have been raised with the application plans not showing the new A&E and nearby key worker accommodation. The submitted plans do show the context of the new TAU ward block in relation to the adjoining Emergency Department, theatre block and main hospital buildings behind. The key worker accommodation is on the opposite side of the access road within the hospital site and is clearly identified on the site location plan.

- *Floodlighting from Golf Club and impact on bed spaces within the new ward block*

Concerns have been raised regarding light pollution from the floodlighting at the nearby Golf Club and how this could affect the bed rooms within the new TAU ward block. Whilst it is noted some of the bedroom windows will face out towards the Golf Club (located to the south), the main windows will face into the access road which is lit by lamp posts (located to the east). Given that there is already a degree of light pollution within the hospital site with lamp posts lighting the access road and the separation distance from the ward block to the golf course, it is unlikely that light pollution nuisance will raise. However, the floodlighting at the Golf Club is subject to planning condition restricting the operating hours, and if these have been breached they will need to be pursued separately by the Planning Enforcement Team.

Full details of external lighting will be conditioned to any forthcoming planning consent.

- *Nature Conservation and ecological considerations*

Concerns have been raised with the potential impact of the application on bat population and concerns raised with the lack of an ecological survey to accompany the planning application. It is noted that the site is located within a built up part of a hospital which is currently occupied by car parking and a substation. It will be located between adjoining buildings and the area is already lit by street lamps on the access road. It is therefore not considered necessary to require an ecological survey for the application. It should also be noted that the adjoining A&E which was built on an area of open space closer to the boundaries of the hospital site did not require an ecological survey as part of the planning application. As part of the new A&E application, 40 replacement trees were secured and a green roof.

Full details of external lighting will be conditioned to any forthcoming planning consent.

Concerns have also been raised with the overall lack of trees within the hospital site as a whole. This application only includes a small part of the hospital site, and will be proposing some tree planting (details of which have been conditioned to any forthcoming consent). There is an overall aspiration to include wider tree planting within the hospital site but this would form part of a wider strategy for the hospital as part of any redevelopment.

- *Flood Risk*

The site is not located within a Flood Risk Zone. Consideration of water management has been considered within the main Committee Report (refer to paragraph 16).

- *Traffic congestion, Travel Plan & disabled parking provision*

Concerns have been raised with the application failing to fully consider the transportation implications of the scheme in the context of wider developments in the area including school expansion. As advised in the main Committee Report, the hospital has various car parks located across the hospital site, with the main multi-storey car park and an extensive pay and display and staff permit system in operation to manage parking demand across the hospital as a whole. Therefore the loss of 10 parking bays is considered to be acceptable by officers in Transportation who have advised that it will not lead to overspill of parking on public highways. The hospital has an existing Travel Plan which is to be reviewed as part of the new Emergency Department. Officers in Transportation have not requested a further review of the Travel Plan specifically for this proposal, although there is a general requirement for the hospital to regularly review its Travel Plan.

Concerns have also been raised with the lack of disabled parking on the hospital site and the need for disabled visitors to park on nearby residential streets and use the bus to access the hospital site. As advised within the main committee report, it is recommended that as this scheme does result in the loss of some disabled bays, a condition is secured to either show the retention of the disabled bays or to provide evidence to show that these spaces are surplus to demand.

**Recommendation: Remains approval subject to completion of satisfactory Section 106 Agreement and conditions as set out after paragraph 29 of the main Committee Report.**



## Agenda Item 05

**Supplementary Information  
Planning Committee on 13 January,  
2015**
**Case No.** 14/1176

---

Location	233 Willesden Lane, Willesden, London, NW2 5RP
Description	Outline planning application for demolition of gymnasium block and erection of part 4, part 5 storey extension, creation of additional storey to main building and roof extensions (matters to be determined: layout and scale)

**Agenda Page Number: 27**

During the recent site visit clarification was sought on the relationship between the proposed 5-storey extension at the northern end of the building and Brondesbury Court, the neighbouring property to the north-west of the site.

The western elevation of the proposed extension would be approximately 8m from the site boundary with the communal areas to the rear of Brondesbury Court. The north-western corner of the proposed extension would be approximately 20m from the south eastern corner of Brondesbury Court. Although there is a level difference between the site both the proposed 5-storey extension and Brondesbury Court are approximately 15m in height. There are a mixture of habitable and non-habitable room windows on the southern and eastern elevations of Brondesbury Court, but given the distance between these windows and the proposed extension, as well as the fact that the rear facing windows at Brondesbury Court are orientated away from the application site, it is not considered that there would be an unreasonably adverse impact on light or privacy.

**Recommendation: Remains Approval subject to s106 and conditions**

DocSuppF

## Agenda Item 06

**Supplementary Information  
Planning Committee on 13 January,  
2015**
**Case No.** 14/2801

---

Location	11A, 11B, 13A & 13B Buller Road, London, NW10 5BS
Description	Demolition of rear outbuildings and rear external staircases, and erection of two storey side and rear extensions to include alterations to front and rear elevations, creation of first floor terraces with glass balustrades to the rear, landscaping to the front and rear, and conversion of four flats at 11A, 11B, 13A & 13B into two single family dwellinghouses

**Agenda Page Number: Page 37**

At the site visit a query was raised regarding the proposed first floor rear terrace and its proximity to the neighbouring rear elevations of the dwellings on Pember Road and whether the relationship is such that it would required higher obscure glazed screens.

As Members heard on Saturday the proposed first floor rear terrace on each property will be set back 3m from the rear wall of the existing two-storey outrigger. To the rear is a row of terraced properties which share a rear boundary with the subject properties. No. 6 Pember directly faces No. 13 and has an existing rear projection which will be approximately 15m from the closest point of the proposed terraced. No. 4 Pember Road also directly faces the subject site and the nearest habitable rooms windows for this property will be over 24m from the proposed terrace. Nos. 2 and 8 Pember Road will have oblique views of the terrace which will be situated over 15m from the rearmost part of the proposed terrace.



The existing first floor flats to both properties have stepped accesses on the rear elevation which are approximately 11m from the proposed rear elevations of the closest neighbouring properties. These will be removed as part of the proposed development. As such it is considered that the privacy of the neighbouring properties will be protected and that it is not necessary to include a higher obscure glazed screen. It will not be possible to have views down into the gardens of the Pember Road properties.

There have been no enforcement complaints regarding the subject properties, however, the neighbouring property at No. 15 Buller Road has been referred to in complaints regarding the unauthorised use of the roof of the two storey rear extension as a balcony. Enforcement Officers have indicated that the last contact they received about the use was in 2010 when the matter was resolved. There is no record of any complaint since then.

**Recommendation:** Remains Approval

DocSuppF

## Agenda Item 07

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 13 January, 2015

Case No.

14/3871

---

Location	227B, 229B, 231B & 233B, All Souls Avenue, London, NW10 3AE
Description	Erection of mansard roof extension to accommodate 2 x two-bedroom flats with associated landscaping and car parking

#### Agenda Page Number: 45

Members requested additional clarification on a number of points following the Committee site visit, these matters are discussed below.

#### ***Servicing, Access and Ownership***

Servicing standard PS17 on page 139 of the Unitary Development Plan requires a 'transit'-sized loading bay for every two retail units, giving a requirement of two van sized (i.e. 3m x 6m) loading bays. With only about three cars/vans able to be independently accommodated at the rear of the site at present, parking and servicing provision currently falls some way short of standards and the building is therefore already reliant on-street parking and servicing to meet its needs. In order to partly address these increased car parking and servicing needs, the appellant proposes to re-surface much of the rear yard in tarmac to accommodate three marked off-street car parking spaces and a loading bay, set back from the highway boundary to provide a turning facility (particularly when the service bay is not in use).

Pedestrian access to the proposed development is taken from All Souls Avenue via the existing access arrangements for the existing residential units via two communal entrances.

With reference to the Council's 'Waste Planning' SPG, the total storage capacity required for the development (including existing units) is 1200 litres of residual waste, 1200 litres of dry recycling and 100l of organic waste. This can be accommodated through the provision of 2 x 'euro bins' and 1 x wheeled bins and the plans show that sufficient space is available to accommodate these bins.

The application is submitted by Mr J Feldman. The ownership certificate submitted with the application indicates that the flats within the development are within separate ownership. This could affect the applicant's ability to undertake refurbishments work outside to the existing building. Planning conditions have been secured to ensure that the landscaping, parking and refuse arrangements proposed are installed prior to occupation of the flats.

#### ***Extract Duct***

There is an existing extract duct to the rear of the building. This duct serves the dry cleaning business situated on the ground floor of No. 231 All Souls Avenue as such there would be no cooking fumes associated with the operation of this facility. Furthermore, it is noted that the duct discharges 5.5m from the rear facing windows of the proposed development and Environmental Health have raised no objection to the proposal.

On this basis it is unlikely that this would result a poor quality living environment for the proposed occupiers.

**Recommendation:** Remains grant permission.

DocSuppF

## Agenda Item 08

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 13 January, 2015

Case No. 14/4076

Location	Car Park, Ainsworth Close, Neasden, London
Description	Erection of 3 (x3 bed) two storey terraced dwellinghouses including formation of off street parking, bin and cycle stores and associated hard and soft landscaping

#### Agenda Page Number: 53

Members visit the site on Saturday. Further clarification is provided below:

#### Relationship with Bell House

Bell House is angled towards the application site because of the bend in the road and this does mean that the relationship has had to be considered in some detail. At its closest points of the existing and proposed buildings are separated by over 12m.

The side boundary to the eastern most house will run along the side of the site from the pavement edge to meet the garden boundary at the back of the site. It is expected that the boundary will be a 2m high fence or wall. This will impact on outlook from the closest ground floor windows in Bell House, however the wall would only project into southern outlook to the closest window. The proposed building is set a further 3.5m away from the site boundary and is not considered to have a significant impact. Officers consider that, whilst there will be an impact on residential amenity, on balance that this relationship will be acceptable.

#### Car Parking & Highways Access

Transportation have reviewed Census data on car ownership and car parking availability, taking Comber Close into account. This area has the same level of car ownership as properties accessed via Ainsworth Close (0.5 cars per dwelling), the two areas together have 132 cars owned across 262 properties. The data is from Census records and considered accurate. On and off-street car parking capacity in the two areas amounts to 258 spaces so there should be sufficient space for the levels of car ownership recorded.

Officers note the issue of roads being difficult to navigate in icy conditions. About 20% of roads in Brent are treated for ice though gritting is concentrated on main roads and steep gradients. A request could be put to the Head of Recycling and Waste for roads in the estate to be considered for the list.

BHP advise that the car park was used by contractors undertaking work in the estate from June 2012 and has been in similar works associated uses since, it has been raised that they have not received complaints about this during this time.

#### Thames Water

Thames Water have now provided a consultation response raising no objection but suggesting the following conditions/informatives which will be added to the decision:

*With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage.*

*When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921.*

*Reason : To ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.*

Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

### **Amenities for Children**

The issue of a lack of play provision within the estate for children has been reiterated and this has been reinforced as some residents believe that the houses are proposed with no amenity space. As set out in the report the houses each have 70sqm of private garden which exceeds the Council's requirements and will limit the additional strain on the estate's existing communal open space.

### **Safety in the Estate**

Some resident's are concerned that the introduction of 3 new homes will worsen issues of antisocial behaviour in the area. While this issue is understood, the houses are designed to create a good level of overlooking in the street and as such in urban design terms may help deter antisocial behaviour.

### **Neighbour Comments**

12 objections in total have now been received from members of the public.

The comments largely reiterate those discussed within the main Committee Report:

- Difficulty using the roads in the estate during severe weather
- Difficulty finding a parking space and some people park inconsiderately making it difficult for pedestrians
- Do not think officers have taken into account the true numbers of cars parked in the estate.
- Additional pollution and noise disturbance from cars
- Lack of additional provision of amenity facilities and issue of children's behaviour around the estate
- New builds around the area in the last 10 or so years have led to overcrowding
- Thames Water need to be consulted given proximity to reservoir.

**Recommendation: Approval subject to conditions listed after paragraph 30 in the main Committee Report and additional condition detailed above.**

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank