



Planning Committee Supplementary Agenda

Thursday 2 July 2015 at 7.00 pm

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

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)

Agha
S Choudhary
Ezeajughi
Mahmood
M Patel
Colacicco
Maurice
Aden
Ms Shaw

Substitute Members

Councillors:

Chohan, Hoda-Benn, Khan, W Mitchell Murray
and Perrin

Councillors

For further information contact: Peter Goss, Democratic Services Manager
020 8937 1353, peter.goss@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

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 6.00pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
13. Supplementary		1 - 8



Please remember to switch your mobile phone to silent during the meeting.

- The Conference Hall is accessible by lift and seats will be provided for members of the public on a first come first served principle.

Agenda Item 13

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2015

Case No. 14/4365

Location	KINGSBURY TOWN F C, Townsend Lane, London, NW9 7NE
Description	Alterations and refurbishments of the existing sports ground and clubhouse to include the demolition of the front porch and erection of a single storey toilet extension, new turnstiles, gates and ticket booths, resurfacing of pathway, replacement pitch barriers, retractable covered walkway, players boxes and new covered seating and standing spectator areas around the ground

Agenda Page Number: 63

Members visited the site on Saturday. Clarification has been provided by the applicant regarding the licensing arrangements which is set out below:

- The premises currently has a pub licence which runs until 4am.
- The management have a current application with the Council for a new licence to reduce the hours until 12 midnight on weekdays, and 2 am on Friday and Saturday.

The management team have advised that the later events will occur 4 times a year and residents will be notified of these occasions. It has also been stated the management would expect most days that everyone will be off site well before 12 midnight.

Representations

Whilst not mentioned in the previous committee report, Councillor Joel Davidson, Councillor Carol Shaw and Councillor John Warren requested that the application be called-in for the following reasons:

1. Residents will suffer a significant increase in noise levels due to the scale of the proposed developments, which are excessive given the club's needs
2. Residents will be affected by much higher level of traffic
3. The plans will result in excessive litter in Townsend Lane.
4. The extra use of the floodlights will impact significantly on the quality of life of local residents.
5. The size of the new stand will have a negative effect on the view/sight of local residents.
6. These proposals will have a negative effect on Silver Jubilee Park, reducing park use for Brent residents and negatively impacting on wildlife in the park.
7. The scale of the proposals is excessive and overwhelming, and insufficient efforts have been made to bring the local community on board.

Due to the number of objections received from residents in regard to this proposal, the Council's Constitution requires the application has to be presented to Planning Committee for determination and therefore the call-in process was not required in this instance.

Additional Representations

Additional representations objecting to the proposal have been received from 32 properties since the Planning Committee report was written.

This includes a representation from Silver Jubilee Park Residents Association objecting to the proposal on behalf of 21 properties, 13 of which have made representations already, resulting in a total of 8 additional objections which are included in the figure above. It is noted that 4 other objections have been received though they have not stated their address and therefore can not form a registered objection.

The points of objection are as follows (and include the comments made by Silver Jubilee Park Residents Association):

- Increased noise;
- Increased litter;
- Increased traffic (contributes to increased amount of potholes);
- Lack of parking spaces;

- Decrease in property values;
- Residential parking permits - large part of borough already has restrictions due to Wembley Stadium;
- People disrespect the environment;
- Drivers ignoring 20mph speed limit;
- More covered seating, stands and turnstiles turn the grounds into a football stadium;
- Proposed level of activity is uncontrollable and unsustainable, bringing no further benefit to the local community;
- Residents right to enjoy their homes will be compromised;
- Increased anti-social behaviour;
- Impact on wildlife;
- Community will not be able to relax and enjoy the open space;
- Roads can't cope with existing parking pressure;
- Security concerns for surrounding residential properties.

Officers response: The above matters have been discussed in the Planning Committee Report. Impact on property values is not a material planning consideration.

6 further representations in support of the application have also been received. The points made in support are as follows:

- School teams play at the facility which is excellent for local children;
- The facilities provide health benefits to the local community
- Provides much needed sports facilities in this part of the borough for residents and school children
- Provides opportunities for local children and encourages them to take part in sport
- The ground is the hub for the community not just football

Recommendation: Grant, subject to conditions set out in decision notice.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 07

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2015

Case No.

15/0687

Location	141 Walm Lane, London, NW2 3AU
Description	<p>Change of use of existing nursing home (Use class C2) to residential (C3) with conversion of the building into six self contained flats (1x 1bed, 3x 2 bed, 1x 3bed and 1x studio flat). To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demolition of existing rear conservatory and rear storage structures and erection of new single storey side/rear extension adjacent to no. 143 Walm Lane; • removal of rear fire escape stairs • replacement of existing rear dormers and lift shaft with 2 new rear dormers containing timber sash windows and insertion of 1 rear rooflight • replacement of existing roof tiles with natural slates tiles; • removal of white paint from frontage • restoration of original porch front • replacement of all existing uPVC windows and widows to existing front dormers with double glazed timber sash windows • setting-back of existing single storey side extension and insertion of non-opening side-hung timber garage doors to frontage and insertion of 1 rooflight • associated forecourt landscaping and 2 parking spaces • Car-free

Agenda Page Number: 91

Since the Agenda was published a number of the changes that Officers had requested should be made to the proposed scheme have been provided in the form of amended drawings.

Revised plans

1. *1st floor Juliet balcony*: There is no Juliet balcony. The rear wall of the 1st floor will now remain as it is with 2 windows and a single door for fire exit. The existing windows and door will not be replaced and as such no new impact from the existing appearance of the rear elevation will be created. The retention of the fire door was raised with building control officers with regards to safety however, it is not necessary to have stairs present at 1st floor level for a fire escape; but guard rails may be required for compliance with building regulations. In order to prevent occupiers using the flat roof outside the fire door as a terrace area, a condition will be attached to ensure no one will use this area for recreational purposes.
2. *Outdoor amenity space -sub-division of rear garden*: The size of the rear garden that is present is generous and will more than fulfill the minimum outdoor amenity space requirements for the development in line with standards set out in SGP17. When measured from the rear building line of flat 3 there is approximately 460sqm of space. However, the proposed layout for rear garden subdivision is considered awkward with its long strip-like section, approx. 110sqm, reserved for communal space and its majority, approx. 280sqm, designated for the 3-bedroom family unit. Approximately 75sqm is designated to the 1 bedroom ground floor flat. Your officers have studied the rear garden plan and have determined that it is possible to achieve not only a better layout for subdivision, but also a better distribution of amenity space that would also not be harmful to the single plot appearance of rear gardens characteristic to the conservation area. It is proposed that through a condition for a new rear garden layout, a better arrangement for sub-division can be sought.
3. *Access to communal garden*: It was requested that a simpler route to the communal garden be provided and that the cycle store be dispersed into other garden spaces. Revised plans show that the internal layout of the ground floor has been altered which does not significantly alter the originally proposed route to the communal garden and bike store. Nevertheless, since some bike storage will be present to the rear of Flat 1 and Flat 3, without them all being stacked together, it is felt that on balance with a better sub-division layout of the rear garden, the access route is acceptable.
4. *Front forecourt* : The general principles and layout of the revised front forecourt plan are welcome, however there are issues of detail which need attention. These include that the existing planting to site frontage should be considered for retention, bin stores cannot open directly onto the street and other matters relating to the proposed layout, including the location of the proposed tree. These can all be considered through the suggested additional condition below and Officers are confident that an acceptable treatment of the front area can be achieved here.

Further representations received

Four more representations were received from 3 individuals. Further concerns were raised about the following:

- *Juliet Balcony*: This feature had appeared on the proposal without consultation. See above.
- *Shared bins*: A general observation is that occupiers/tenants are reluctant to share bins because someone will place the wrong refuse in the wrong bins. Placing a condition to restrict the number of shared bins would be difficult given that future policy changes in connection with this would be by the Waste & Recycling team.
- *Over parking on forecourt*: To add a condition for only 2 cars to be parked on the forecourt in order to prevent other cars parking on the forecourt
- *Front chimney stacks*: These should be retained despite proposals showing they have been removed. A condition will be attached to ensure they are not removed.
- *Slate tiles & ridge tiles*: The roof finish should be in slate and the decorative ridge tiles restored. The applicant is aware of the requirement for natural slate at the roof covering. The requirement for ridge tiles will be set as a condition

Additional conditions

Details of the front garden layout shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. All detailed works shall be carried out as approved prior to the occupation of the premises. Such details shall include:

- (i) planting of the front garden area with shrubs and/or trees including the provision of a planting schedule;
- (ii) indication of the retention of any existing hedges and shrubs;
- (iii) provision or retention of front garden wall or walls or other forms of boundary treatment;
- (iv) car parking space for cars, the defined points of access and the surfacing materials to be used;
- (v) waste and recycling storage facilities should be screened from the public highway;

Any planting that is part of the approved scheme that within a period of five years after planting is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season and all planting shall be replaced with others of a similar size and species and in the same position, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

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, in the interests of the amenities of the occupants of the development and to provide tree planting in pursuance of section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

No access shall be provided to the roof of the extension by way of window, door or stairway and the roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area.

Reason: To preserve the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers and to help preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Mapesbury Conservation Area.

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plan, the existing front chimney stacks shall be retained and restored with pots and shall be retained and shall not be altered or removed without prior written planning consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the property retains characteristic features of the property that help preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Mapesbury Conservation Area.

The external finish of the roof shall comprise natural slate roof tiles and decorative clay ridge tiles.

Reason: To ensure the property retains characteristic features of the property that help preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Mapesbury Conservation Area.

Recommendation: Remains approval with additional conditions.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 09

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2015

Case No.

15/0064

Location	All Flats at Jubilee Heights, Shoot Up Hill, London, NW2 3UQ
Description	Erection of a 6-storey building comprising 5 x 2 bedroom self-contained flats with roof garden attached to the Jubilee Heights building to also include the removal of existing vehicular access and cross over off Shoot Up Hill and installation of new pedestrian gates, railing and brick piers with access from Exeter Road

Agenda Page Number: 129

Members visited the site on 27th June 2015. A number of issues were raised.

LEGAL ISSUES

The applicants own the freehold of the main site to be developed and have been conveyed land to accommodate sufficient parking for the proposed flats. The car parking issues are covered in the main Committee Report, including an analysis of the total numbers of spaces required for a residential development of this size. Whilst the concern of the residents is obviously understood, any issues with the previous freeholder cannot be considered as relevant to the consideration of this application which needs to be determined on its individual planning merits.

ACCESS

Transportation Engineers support the removal of the vehicular access from Shoot Up hill, as it is generally a

benefit in road safety and traffic flow terms to reduce the number of points of access onto a Major London distributor road. Fire access requirements can be catered for without bringing the vehicle onto the site.

In terms of construction matters, conditions 6 (Considerate Contractors Scheme) and 9 (Construction Method Statement) seek to mitigate the possible impact of the development. Whilst the concern of residents is understood, if a scheme is considered to be acceptable in planning terms, as this one is for the reasons set down in the report, it would be unreasonable for permission to be withheld on the basis of questions as to how the development might be implemented or what might happen whilst the development is taking place.

LANDSCAPING

As set down in the main Committee report, existing good quality trees on the site are to be retained and additional planting is to be provided. Although there will be the loss of some greenery on the site this is not of such quality so as to resist the development on the basis of its removal.

IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Paragraph 22 of the Committee report deals with this point. As indicated a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment has been submitted with the application, which demonstrates no unacceptable impact on existing residents as a result of the proposal. As explained the flank windows which we seen on the site visit serve galley windows.

In terms of the ground floor front facing flat that was mentioned at the weekend the proposed building will be set away from the nearest window. The ground floor window that was seen on site and is nearest to the corner of the building is understood to be a store room.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to conditions and Affordable Housing contribution

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 10

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2015

Case No.

15/1539

Location	24-51 INC, John Barker Court, 12-14 Brondesbury Park, Kilburn, London, NW6 7BW
Description	Change of use of existing flats at 24-51, John Barker Court, into a hostel (Use class Sui Generis) for a temporary period of 1 year

Agenda Page Number: 153

Members visited the site on 27th June 2015.

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Following the publication of the Committee report comments from the Met Police Crime Prevention Officer who advise on secure by design issues have been received. The comments have been shared with the applicants for further consideration in terms of the best approach to the management of the use. In particular, it is proposed that clear signage is recommended to direct people to the main entrance of the subject block and this is something that needs to subject to an additional condition.

"Further details of the siting and appearance of directional signage to be erected on the site in order to direct people to the main entrance of the building shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the building. Once approved the signage must be installed, as approved, and permanently maintained for the lifetime of the use."

Reason: In order to allow the Local Authority to exercise proper control; over the development in the interests of amenity."

POINTS OF CLARIFICATION

John Barker Court will used be used as a resource to house households who have become homeless. The vast majority of these households will be families, it is envisaged that only a small number of single households will be housed at the site. The proposal will provide 26 double rooms, with shared facilities, communal kitchens and bathrooms. The permission would be for a period of one year only and if at the end of the period it was intended

to extend the use (notwithstanding the fact that the applicants have indicated that there is no intention to do this) it would be necessary to submit a new planning application to be considered at that time taking into account anything that might have happened in the intervening period.

As set out in the main report, and mentioned at the weekend, neighbours are concerned about opportunities for anti-social behaviour. The applicant has confirmed that only sensitive lets will be made to John Barker Court and any clients with a history of anti-social behaviour will not be referred to the scheme. In the event that ASB did occur there will be staff on site 24 hours a day and 7 days a week able to manage any incidents.

Altwood Housing Ltd were appointed in February 2012 by Brent Council to manage a similar scheme, Knowles House in Longstone Avenue, which is owned by Brent Council. The experience of operating Knowles House will inform the management of John Barker Court and this will specifically include 24 hour on site staffing, monitored CCTV and a maintenance team on call 24 hours a day. Upkeep of the site will be undertaken by the maintenance team who will carry out a litter pick daily. The cost of this has been included in any savings quoted in the main body of the report.

At the Members site visit there was discussion about the neighbour consultation exercise that took place in connection with the application. This is to confirm that Alan Preece Court were consulted about the proposal on 5 May 2015 and comments have been submitted from that building indicating that the letters were received.

Recommendation: Remains approval for a period of 12 months, with additional condition.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 11

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 2 July, 2015

Case No.

14/1544

Location	58 Neasden Lane, London, NW10 2UJ
Description	Partial demolition and change of use of the retained building from light industrial (Use Class B1) to 69 room hotel (Use class C1), including ancillary restaurant, 11 car-parking spaces, 1 coach parking bay, 1 taxi bay, 1 servicing bay, 14 cycle parking spaces and associated landscaping, alterations to windows, metal railing and fire escape stairs.

Agenda Page Number: 175

Councillor Representation

Councillors K.Hirani and J.Long have submitted representations as Ward Councillors in support of the scheme.

They say that the site is derelict and is of no benefit to the area. This application will bring a minimum of 25 jobs to the area which is an improvement on zero. In addition there will also be jobs during the construction of the development which have not been counted in the 25 figure. In terms of whether a hotel is an acceptable use, there has been a spike in hotel development in Wembley and all seem to be thriving. The Neasden location identified is opposite Neasden Tube Station and is ideally located for a Central London commute.

Site Visit

Following the recent site visit clarification is provided on a number of issues seeking to emphasise the fundamental nature of the planning considerations here. These are addressed below.

Hotel Use

As set out in the main report, the NPPF and local planning policy defines hotel development as a main town centre use and sets out that a sequential test should be applied to proposals whereby such uses are only permitted in out-of-centre locations where there are no sites available in nearby town centre or edge of centre locations. During the site visit clarification was sought in terms of the sites location in relation to Neasden town centre and Church Road local centre. The subject site is located at least 400m and 850m from the boundaries of Neasden town centre and Church End local centre respectively. The NPPF clarifies that in order for a site to be considered edge-of-centre it must be within 300m of the town centre boundary. As such, the site is clearly

neither in a town centre location nor an edge of centre location and therefore in the absence of evidence to demonstrate that there are no other sequentially preferable locations available locally, the proposals are not considered to comply with the NPPF or the Local Development Plan.

Vacancy

During the site visit it was observed that the building is largely vacant at present, particularly in terms of industrial employment use. As set out in the main report the applicant has provided a marketing report detailing the efforts that have been made to find a tenant for the existing building since April 2013. Officers acknowledge that the site has been vacant for some time but would point out that in the case of sites within Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS), planning policy does not allow for their release purely on the basis of vacancy alone, unlike undesignated Local Employment Sites. The planning policy position is concerned with the supply of land for industrial employment uses and whilst it may be the case that there is only limited demand for the existing building on site, perhaps due to its poor condition, that the Employment Land Demand Study does provide evidence for protecting the amount of land required for such uses, even if that land needs to be redeveloped, either partially or wholly, in order to meet the needs of Brent's businesses. It is noted that the marketing study provided is focussed on finding a tenant for the existing building rather than promoting the site for redevelopment for alternative industrial employment uses.

Employment

The planning policy position on LSIS protects the site for industrial employment uses. Whilst it is acknowledged that a hotel would also generate employment, as discussed above, this type of employment may be more appropriately provided for within town centres and edge of centre locations. The designation of LSIS's provides land for local employment within the industrial sector, and therefore whilst a hotel use may, or may not, provide more jobs than an industrial use on the site it ensures that land is available for a diverse range of employment uses.

Recommendation: Remains Refusal

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank