



Supplementary Planning Committee

Wednesday 9 March 2016 at 7.00 pm

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

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)
Agha (Vice-Chair)
S Choudhary
Colacicco
Ezeajughi
Mahmood
Maurice
M Patel

Substitute Members

Councillors:

Chohan, A Choudry, Hoda-Benn, Hylton, Khan
and W Mitchell Murray

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

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:
democracy.brent.gov.uk

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 5.30pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
2. Minutes of the previous meetings		1 – 14
3. Moberly Sports Centre, Kilburn Lane, North Kensington, London, W10 4AH (Ref.15/4226)	Queens Park	15 - 18
4. Land at the Junction of Brondesbury Park & Christchurch Avenue Christchurch Avenue, London (Ref.16/0169)	Brondesbury Park	19 - 22
5. College of North West London, Priory Park Road, London, NW6 7UJ (Ref.15/0406)	Kilburn	23 - 24
6. Land East of Victoria Centre, Acton Lane, London (Ref.15/4496)	Stonebridge	25 - 26
7. Community Centre, Crystal House, 2 Agate Close, London, NW10 7FJ (Ref.15/4559)	Stonebridge	27 - 28
9. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley (Ref.15/5394)	Tokyngham	29 - 30
10. Byron Court Primary School, Spencer Road, Wembley, HA0 3SF (Ref.15/4523)	Northwick Park	31 - 36
11. Uxendon Manor Primary School, Vista Way, Harrow, HA3 0UX (Ref.15/5240)	Kenton	37 - 38



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Tuesday 26 January 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Marquis (Chair), Agha (Vice-Chair), S Choudhary, Colacicco, Ezeajughi, Mahmood, Maurice and M Patel

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

None.

2. **Review of SPG5 - Altering and Extending Your Home**

The current Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 (SPG5) 'Altering and Extending Your Home' was adopted in 2002 and although it has served its purpose well, due to its age it requires updating. The report set out the areas proposed to be reviewed for the document to reflect practical experience of its use and to take into account of changes in permitted development rights/prior approvals and increases in development activity including basements.

Paul Lewin (Planning Policy and Projects Manager) introduced the report. He drew members' attention to the changes to permitted development rights for residential extensions and ancillary buildings/structures and more recently the introduction of Prior Approvals. These potentially allowed development to occur which is inconsistent with some aspects of the SPG particularly distances anticipated between buildings and greater emphasis being placed on the quality of amenity to existing and future occupants. Members were also informed that particularly in the southern part of the Borough there has also been an increased demand for basement extensions which needed to be reflected in the SPG5. In respect of conservation area, he stated that some guidance existed in conservation area design guides however, a review of SPG 5 would also allow opportunity to provide more up to date advice and a wider corporate response to issues outside direct planning control such as skip permits, parking bay suspensions and parking enforcement.

In the discussion that ensued, members welcomed the need for the review and recommended also a separate SPG for basement developments. They also suggested that at the pre-application stage, applicants should be encouraged to cover issues such as the potential impacts on structural integrity and a flood risk assessment by a competent expert. Members also requested a clear section on Conservation Area policy and that officers should work with other departments of the Council on the control of public realm nuisances.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the need to review SPG 5 Altering and Extending Your Home be agreed;
- (ii) that subject to incorporation of members' feedback on basement developments and conservation area policy, the SPG 5 document Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document be issued for public consultation.

3. Review of SPG17 - Design Guide for New Developments

The current SPG Design Guide for New Developments was adopted in 2001. The document has served its purpose well but due to its age requires updating. Since 2001 planning policy has changed significantly, particularly in relation to urban areas with much greater emphasis on maximising development density and the promotion of the efficient use of land particularly in areas of high public transport accessibility consistent with London Plan Policy 3.2: Optimising Housing Potential. The proposed review of the SPG17 document would also provides the opportunity for it to be a promotional tool, giving a positive message about development potential within Brent and the need for high quality design.

Paul Lewin (Planning Policy and Projects Manager) informed the Committee that the current SPG17, which primarily has a focus on the typical inter-war suburban context of Brent, was relevant in areas to much of the Borough where major change to the existing character was not envisaged.. However, there may be scope for greater flexibility for areas of larger transformational change, such as South Kilburn or Wembley where densities much higher than traditionally provided in Brent were anticipated. With reference to the report, he set out the steps towards achieving improved and successful developments in the borough.

Paul Lewin also clarified the approach to tall buildings adding that Brent's policy was in keeping with the London Plan. In working through the document members made various points which officers noted down. In terms of understanding and promoting design improvements, Members indicated a need for plans and images for residential and commercial proposals of sufficient quality to be submitted to enable them to be more fully considered and to reduce the risk of delay in decision making. They also indicated a desire to develop existing opportunities to see proposals at an earlier stage in the planning application process, e.g. pre-application stage. Members suggested that wherever possible separate entrances for affordable housing units and owner occupiers should be avoided and that schemes should design out crime, particularly anti-social behaviour (ASBO). Members also queried the scope to amend the current general approach if densities and heights were significantly greater. In concluding on the item, the chair indicated that whilst it might not be appropriate to incorporate all changes to comments made, that officers should provide a response to members of the Committee as to how they had dealt with the points raised prior to consultation on the document commencing.

RESOLVED:-

- (I) that the existing general approach within the guidance and the need to review and produce a new Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document to reflect its application within the Borough be supported;
- (ii) that subject to incorporation of feedback from members, a draft Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document be issued for public consultation.

4. Planning Policy Work Programme 2016-2017

The report from the Head of Planning set out potential projects for the coming year with indicative timescales of work. The report was intended to allow the Planning Committee to understand the context and to provide an input to forming Planning's work programme for areas covering the policy review and development function. Members' input will feed into the wider service planning process and, in particular, the Peer Review process for Planning programmed for March 2016.

Stephen Weeks (Head of Planning) drew members' attention to the work programme for 2016/17, identifying the priority areas and those areas which were subject to confirmation, as set out in the report. He highlighted work associated with the adoption of the Development Management Policies Development Plan to replace all remaining policies in the 'saved' Unitary Development Plan and also the South Kilburn Masterplan. Members queried the position on progressing the update to the local list and indicated support for the work to continue and be adopted as soon as possible. Members heard that as there were no objections to the pub protection policy the policy would be likely to be recommended for adoption with no major changes.

RESOLVED:-

that the areas of the work programme indicated for year 2016-17 service planning purposes as set out in the report from Head of Planning be agreed.

5. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

COUNCILLOR S MARQUIS
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 10 February 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Marquis (Chair), Agha (Vice-Chair), S Choudhary, Colacicco, Ezeajughi, Mahmood, Maurice and M Patel

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Chohan, W Mitchell Murray, Perrin and Shahzad OBE

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

- 3 Garages next to and rear of 13-24, Mead Court and Communal Facility & Laundry, Mead Court, Buck Lane, London NW9 (Ref 15/4604)
Councillor Mili Patel declared that as she was a Trustee of the Board of Governors of Brent Housing Partnership (BHP), the applicant, she would leave the meeting room during consideration of the application and would not take part in the discussion or voting.
- 5 CAR PARK, Montrose Crescent & Land N/T 499 & 509 High Road, Wembley (including existing steps connecting to High Rd, Wembley with Station Grove), HA0 (Ref. 15/4473)
The applicant gave a presentation to members and officers. Members also received plans of the scheme from the applicant.
- 7 Moberly Sports Centre, Kilburn Lane, North Kensington, London, W10 4AH (Ref. 15/4226)
All members received emails from the applicant's representative, Michael Holloway and from Councillor Denselow indicating his concerns.

All members re-affirmed that they would be considering all the applications with an open mind.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 January 2016 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2015

The Committee agreed the following amendment to the minutes relating to the application for 31 Montrose Avenue.

"Janis Denselow (an objector) reiterated that residents were not convinced by the applicant's Construction Method Statement and added that their concerns, including the protection of the nearby tree, had not been addressed. She

requested a deferral of this and any similar proposals to enable a study to be carried out on how other local authorities approached similar applications.”

3. Garages next to and rear of 13-24, Mead Court and Communal Facility & Laundry, Mead Court, Buck Lane, London NW9 (Ref 15/4604)

PROPOSAL: Demolition and replacement of existing derelict garages and laundry building with two pairs of 2 storey three bedroom semi-detached houses with associated car parking spaces, realignment of existing path to proposed dwellings, reinstatement of hard-standing as amenity space, landscaping and lighting to the public realm.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice with amendments to condition 3 as set out in the supplementary report.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the scheme and with reference to the supplementary report responded to queries raised by members at the site visit. He advised members that details of fencing to improve safety and security would be required through an amendment to condition 3 as set out in the supplementary report. He continued that the applicant, Brent Housing Partnership (BHP), had taken on board the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed trees to the new houses and would work with the Council's Tree Officer and Landscape Officer to consider appropriate species and location for the proposed trees. David Glover also drew members' attention to BHP's responses to queries raised about cyclical repairs for the estate and the apportionment of service charges as set out in the supplementary report.

Joe Powell (applicant's agent) and Richard De Ville (BHP) attended the meeting and responded to members' queries. The applicant's agent stated that the application had been designed following pre-application meetings to ensure that the proposal complied with National and Local policies including SPG17. He added that the scheme for family dwellings, intended for social rent, would not only assist with housing needs but would also involve significant improvements including the provision of 21 car parking spaces, new lighting, an improved landscaping scheme and recycling facilities.

In response to members' questions, the applicant's agent stated that a Construction Management Plan and a Method Statement which would seek to address concerns about construction traffic (including a requirement to consider routing construction traffic through Kingsbury Road) and reinstatement of damaged pavements would be submitted. He added that further soil investigation would be carried out to ensure sound foundations. The applicant's agent continued that BHP would assess the need for disabled parking and designate spaces for their use. Members heard that BHP was committed to working with the Council to ensure a satisfactory development and would restore any damage to the road or pavement caused during construction.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended and an additional condition requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan.

4. Brent House, 349-357 High Road, Wembley, HA9 6BZ (Ref. 15/4743)

PROPOSAL: Proposed demolition of existing office building and erection of two buildings of between eight and ten storeys accommodating 248 dwellings (84 x 1-bedroom, 108 x 2-bedroom, 49 x 3-bedroom & 7 x 4-bedroom units) and flexible commercial space at ground floor (for Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and/or B1(a)), new public square, landscaped communal gardens, associated landscape works, alterations to existing crossover(s) and basement car and cycle parking.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the referral to the Mayor of London and to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Head of Legal Services, subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice and additional conditions regarding drainage and vibro-impact works as set out in the supplementary report.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme and referenced the supplementary report. He clarified the servicing and parking arrangements and added that platform lifts would be provided adjacent to the main loading bay to allow goods to be moved from delivery vehicles to their destination. This measure would seek to address level changes across the site. He continued that anticipated infrastructure expected to include new schools, extensions to existing local schools, nursery places, at least 2.4ha of new public open space, improvements to accessibility of existing open space, a new community swimming pool, new health facilities (for GP's and dentists) and new multi-use community facilities would be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) of £3.5 million. In addition, he understood that the applicant had agreed to the £319, 000 bus capacity enhancement contributions that TfL had identified as being required in this area. This contribution would be secured through the s106 legal agreement. He recommended a further condition as set out in the supplementary report in response to the GLA Stage 1 report and their comments on sustainable drainage.

Mark Pender (applicant's agent), Nick Budd (Transport Consultant) and Peter Smith (applicant's architect) attended the meeting to clarify issues raised by members. The applicant's agent informed the Committee that an extensive consultation which engaged the GLA, TfL, local community and local schools had taken place to ensure the development made maximum use of a brownfield site in a town centre. He continued that the development, which would provide acceptable density limits, would incorporate private balconies to all flats in addition to a children's play area.

In response to members' questions, Mark Pender stated that full accessibility standards had been complied with including the provision of a lift service available for use by disabled persons. He anticipated demolition of the existing structure to commence within 6 months and 24 months to complete the building. The

Committee heard that statutory bodies including TfL and Network Rail were consulted on the application but did not raise concerns about the applicant's detailed noise and traffic assessment. He added that the proposal which would not raise safety issues would have a separation distance of 9 metres from the nearest building in addition to adequate capacity to accommodate servicing vehicles.

In welcoming the report, members agreed additional conditions requiring details of balconies and a covered area from the car park to assist disabled persons.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended and additional conditions on details of balconies and the canopy for disabled persons.

5. Car park Montrose Crescent & Land N/T 499 & 509 High Road, Wembley (including existing steps connecting to High Rd, Wembley with Station Grove), HA0 (Ref. 15/4473)

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of Montrose Crescent car park and land n/t 499 and 509 High Road, Wembley to include a part 3, 6, 13 and 18 storey development on Curtis Lane and a part 4 and 6 storey building on the High Road, Wembley comprising of 186 residential units (43 x 1 bed, 108 x 2 bed and 35 x 3 bed), 1,312 sqm of commercial space comprising A1, A2, A3, A5, B1(a) and/or D1 uses, replacement public car park comprising of 89 public car parking spaces, associated amenity space, landscaping, cycle parking, new lift access to High Road together with alterations to existing stepped access from the High Road to Curtis Lane and Station Grove and public realm improvements.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the referral to the Mayor of London and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Head of Legal Services and conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice and to amendments in the Section 106 Heads of Terms as set out in the supplementary report.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the scheme and by reference to the supplementary report clarified the issues raised at the site visit. He advised that extensive works including a new road layout to upgrade Curtis Lane had been accepted by Transportation officers and that the proposed loading bays to serve existing commercial units along Ealing Road could be used by both commercial vehicles and delivery vans. In respect of the impact on Lodge Court, he submitted that robust testing of daylight and sunlight conditions carried out had confirmed that adequate sunlight and daylight environment would be maintained, thus the scheme complied with BRE Guidelines. He drew members' attention to the separation distance of 26metres between buildings which was in excess of the 20m required under SPG17. He clarified that the affordable units would be 38 and not 34 as stated in the main report and drew attention to amendments to the Heads of Terms of the s106 legal agreement in respect of s278 works.

Ken Meadows objected on the grounds that the proposed development would result in loss of sunlight and loss of privacy. He urged the Committee to require the applicant to relocate the blocks to the west side of Lodge Court in order to preserve the amenities of Lodge Court residents.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor W Mitchell-Murray, ward member, stated that she had been approached by residents of Lodge Court and Manor Court. Although welcoming the application, Councillor Mitchell-Murray expressed concerns about loss of light particularly to the eastern side of Lodge Court and felt that the orientation of the building could be re-arranged to minimise the impact. She added that residents of Lodge and Manor Court were not consulted on the application and questioned the need for an 18 storey block. Councillor W Mitchell-Murray sought officers' comments on wind assessment and the potential conflicts between delivery vehicles and the bus stand to the front of the proposed building.

Emma White (applicant's agent) and Michael Harper (Daylight and Sunlight Consultant) attended the meeting to respond to queries raised. Emma White informed the Committee that the scheme, which would deliver 186 new homes including affordable units, would assist in the regeneration of the site by the re-provision of the car park and public realm improvements, whilst respecting the amenities of other neighbours. She continued that the application was widely consulted upon which resulted in significant revisions to achieve a scheme that minimised any potential negative impact to other neighbours. Michael Harper explained the daylight and sunlight assessments and the findings which concluded that Lodge Court and Manor Court residents would continue to receive uninterrupted sunlight levels above guideline requirements. The applicant's agent added that the public car park, which the parking survey found to be under-utilised would be privately managed and would be within the Council's controlled charging structure. She confirmed that there would be no bus stand on Station Grove.

Stephen Weeks (Head of Planning) added that an extensive consultation including a public exhibition was carried out last year in addition to about 550 letters sent to local residents including those at Lodge Court. He confirmed that the applicant submitted wind and impact assessments with the application. In response to a member's question, the Head of Planning stated that the development should not normally affect local water supply during construction.

John Fletcher (Development Control, Highways) advised that the applicant would be required to enter into a s278 agreement to ensure that highway controls would be in place for the development.

In welcoming the application, members agreed to add further conditions as set out below to address potential highways impact.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended and the following additional conditions; that the Use Class D1 use shall exclude places of worship; an additional servicing bay is provided on Montrose Crescent; applicant to upgrade the pavement on south side of the High Road to the junction with Ealing

Road; the highway controls to be reviewed pursuant to the Section 278 agreement.

6. 271-273 Kilburn High Road, London, NW6 7JR (Ref. 15/3695)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing building and erection of a part four, part five storey building comprising an A3 unit (restaurant/cafe) on the ground floor and 7x self-contained flats (7 x 1 bed) on the upper floors with associated bin and cycle storage.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

Angus Saunders (Area Planning Manager) introduced the proposal and with reference to the supplementary report responded to issues raised at the site visit in respect of overlooking and daylight and sunlight impact. He informed members that the applicant had submitted details to show a 1.2m deep planter along the side facing the units on 275 Kilburn High Road to demonstrate that overlooking would not result. However, and in response to Member's queries, a privacy screen could be located along this section by amending the proposed landscape condition. He continued that whilst there would be some impact on the second floor flat facing the flank facade (Flat 5, 275 Kilburn High Road), on balance, he considered it to be limited and not sufficient to merit a refusal. He added that whilst the BRE Sunlight/Daylight assessment did not satisfy every scenario, it showed strong conformity with the broader assessment of the proposals.

In addressing the concerns expressed by the Tricycle Theatre, Angus Saunders informed the Committee that as the development would be located to the north of the Theatre, the Theatre would not be overshadowed by the proposals nor its operation unduly affected.

Tom Gilmore objected to the proposed development on the grounds that it would materially harm the living conditions of the residents at 275 Kilburn High Road through loss of outlook and increased noise level. He added that illegal parking in the vicinity would result due to the operation of the nearby café and raised concerns that the EB7 report was based on theoretical data as the rooms were bigger than stated and would therefore be darker than reported.

Graham Sproul objecting on behalf Tricycle Theatre stated that due to its excessive scale and size, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties including the Tricycle Theatre. The impact on the theatre including noise and overshadowing, would be more significant as it conducted rehearsals throughout the day.

Patrick O'Sullivan objecting on behalf of Peabody Estates (owners of the adjoining properties) echoed similar sentiments and added that due to its size and its proximity to the Peabody properties, the proposal would give rise to overlooking to balconies. He urged the Committee to require the applicant to submit a Construction Management Plan to demonstrate their commitment to minimise

construction impact. Patrick O'Sullivan also expressed concerns about lack of controls to access to the green roof.

Robert O'Hara (applicant's agent) stated that the proposal would not have an unacceptable daylight and sunlight impact and loss of outlook to adjoining properties. He added his company had designed the building at 275 Kilburn High Road and therefore had accurate information on which to base their report. He also stated that the Construction Management Plan to be submitted would set out in more detail measures to minimise construction impact on the neighbours.

In the ensuing discussion, members were minded to endorse officers' recommendation for approval however, they added additional conditions relating to balcony privacy screens, control of access to green roofs, maintenance of ventilation and an amendment to condition 8 for a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) requiring advice on delivery vehicles for neighbouring properties.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended, with additional conditions relating to balcony privacy screens, control of access to green roofs, maintenance of ventilation and an amendment to condition 8 for a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) requiring advice on delivery vehicles for neighbouring properties.

7. Moberly Sports Centre, Kilburn Lane, North Kensington, London, W10 4AH (Ref. 15/4226)

PROPOSAL: Details pursuant to condition 17 (Construction Logistics Plan) relating to planning application reference 13/3682 dated 04/02/2015 for full planning permission sought for demolition of all existing buildings and erection of a part 7/part 6/part 5/part 4-storey building with 9293sqm of Sports and Leisure Centre (Use Class D2), 56 flats (22 x 1-bed, 34 x 2-bed) and 240sqm of retail floor space (Use Class A1/A2/A3) and erection of 15 terraced townhouses (15 x 4-bed) with associated car and cycle parking and landscaping and subject to a Deed of Agreement dated 02 February 2015 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

Angus Saunders (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme and with reference to the supplementary report responded to queries raised at the site visit. Members heard that the suspension of the parking bays opposite the loading bay would maintain two-way traffic flow for cars along Chamberlayne Road and was thus considered an improvement on the current situation. He advised that the widening of the carriageway or strengthening of the footway to accommodate loading on the footway was likely to be very costly to the applicant and difficult to achieve. On pollution, the Area Planning Manager maintained that whilst there was evidence to suggest that idling vehicles could result in increased air pollution and congestion, the impact of the proposal would not result in considerably worse congestion than the existing situation. He continued that alternative locations for

off-site loading had been considered and discounted. He explained that Bannister Road or Kilburn Lane as potential off-site loading areas were considered impractical and to carry greater challenges than that of Chamberlayne Road. He clarified that Banister Road was a short road with bus stops on both sides and Kilburn Lane was a residential road with parking bays along its length.

John Keutgen, Chair of Aylestone Park Residents and Tenants Association (APRATA) speaking on behalf of the association and other local residents' associations: Kensal Rise and Kensal Triangle, stated that an unacceptable level of congestion would ensue as unloading would take much longer than advised. He added that alternative sites for unloading facilities existed which the applicant had not explored. He continued that the proposal, which he considered would fail to respect the environment, would cause a significant disturbance to Chamberlayne Road residents.

Simon Taylor, Nick Judd and John Howard (applicant's agents) attended the meeting to respond to queries raised by objectors and members. Members were informed that since the scheme was approved, the applicant had been working in close partnership with officers of the Council to discharge all conditions. The agents continued that restricted hours had been agreed for off-site loading and when not in use the loading bays would be returned to normal use. In addition, an online booking system for deliveries was in place to ensure that disruption to the highway was minimised. In response to members' questions, the agents stated that there were only two deliveries per day each taking on average between 30 and 60 minutes and that traffic marshals and banks men were on hand to assist with the deliveries

During the discussion that followed, members expressed concerns about the traffic impact resulting from disruption to traffic on Chamberlayne Road, the extent to which alternative locations had been explored, pollution from unloading and the impact on shops in Chamberlayne Road. For those reasons members were minded to refuse the application contrary to officers' recommendation for approval.

Voting on the officers' recommendation for approval was recorded as follows:

FOR:	Councillor Agha, Choudhary	(2)
AGAINST:	Councillors Marquis and Colacicco, Ezeajughi, Mahmood and Maurice	(5)
ABSTENTION:	Councillor Mili Patel	(1)

DECISION: Refused planning permission for the following reasons; traffic impact resulting from disruption to traffic on Chamberlayne Road, impact on local shops in Chamberlayne Road and traffic pollution arising from unloading..

8. 76-78 Salusbury Road, London, NW6 6PA (Ref. 15/4590)

PROPOSAL: Change of use of the 1st, 2nd and part of the ground floor of the public house (Use class A4) to create 8 self-contained flats (3 x 1bed, 3 x 2bed and 2 x 3bed) together with associated alterations to include removal of rear

dormer window, new 2nd floor rear extension, stairwell extension, replacement and relocation of some of the windows, insertion of new windows and roof lights, terraces and screening, cycle parking spaces and bin stores.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission for reasons set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

Angus Saunders (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme and with reference to the supplementary report responded to the issues raised at the site visit in relation to noise, entrance to the public house and community use of the property. He confirmed that there was an extensive history of noise complaints with the site according to meetings held between Environmental Health officers and local residents and with the operator. He continued that due to the commercial character of the area, the use of the entrance on the corner of Hopefield Avenue would not necessarily lead to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the residents. The Area Planning Manager added that as far as he had established, the community groups had relocated to nearby Salusbury School and Salusbury Rooms. In respect of a query from a resident regarding a commuted sum in lieu of direct re-provision of community facilities and community access to the pub proposed by the applicant, the Area Planning Manager advised that it had not been possible, given the time allowed, to open discussions on this matter with the applicant.

The Area Planning Manager reiterated his recommendation for refusal on the grounds that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposal would provide adequate community space with minimum access arrangements and how the proposed community access would interact with the pub without adversely affecting the viability of the pub.

Judy Wilcox an objector speaking on behalf of the Hopefield Avenue residents raised concerns on the application on grounds of noise nuisance from staff and visitors to the pub and added that the applicant had consistently failed to adhere to planning conditions including amplified music and hours of operation of the event rooms. The objector added that whilst some groups had moved to other sites, the use of the premises by the other remaining groups would worsen the problems being experienced by residents. She also reiterated residents' objection to the use of the entrance to the pub on the corner of Hopefield Avenue and Salusbury Road.

Kieron Hodgson (applicant's agent) stated that the proposed development would bring the building, which was currently empty, back into a mixed use scheme. The proposal would re-provide at ground floor level, an improved and bigger room with good general amenity and the conversion of the hitherto noisy first floor event room to residential accommodation. In response to members' questions, the applicant's agent responded that the applicant would be amenable to the suggestion to provide community facility off-site and that the entrance doors on Hopefield Avenue would not be used.

Members discussed the application during which they were minded to grant planning permission contrary to officers' recommendation for refusal subject to clarification on a number of issues. They therefore decided to defer the application to the next meeting to enable officers to review any off-site contribution and clarify the details of the on site community provision and potential conditions regarding future use of the facilities covering hours of use, amplified sound, access arrangements and external activities.

Voting on the substantive recommendation for refusal for reasons set out in the main report was recorded as follows:

FOR:	Councillor Choudhary	(1)
AGAINST:	Councillors Marquis, Colacicco, Mahmood, Maurice and Mili Patel	(5)
ABSTENTION:	Councillors Agha and Ernest	(2)

DECISION: Deferred to the next meeting to enable officers to review any off-site contribution and to clarify the details of any site community provision and potential conditions regarding future use of the facilities covering hours of use, amplified sound, access arrangements and external activities.

9. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 10.55 pm

S MARQUIS
Chair

Note: At 10.00pm, the Committee voted to disapply the Guillotine procedure so as to enable all applications to be considered on the night.

Agenda Item 03

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/4226

Location Moberly Sports Centre, Kilburn Lane, North Kensington, London, W10 4AH
Description Details pursuant to condition 17 (Construction Logistics Plan) relating to planning application reference 13/3682 dated 04/02/2015 for full planning permission sought for demolition of all existing buildings and erection of a part 7/part 6/part 5/part 4-storey building with 9293sqm of Sports and Leisure Centre (Use Class D2), 56 flats (22 x 1-bed, 34 x 2-bed) and 240sqm of retail floor space (Use Class A1/A2/A3) and erection of 15 terraced townhouses (15 x 4-bed) with associated car and cycle parking and landscaping and subject to a Deed of Agreement dated 02 February 2015 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended

Agenda Page Number: 5-26

1. Amendments to objections previously received from APRATA, KRRR and KTRA

The Applicant met with local residents associations and have provided further information subsequent to the that meeting and following this all the local residents associations who had originally objected to the proposal (APRATA, KRRR and KTRA) accept Chamberlayne Road as the location for an off site loading bay and no longer object to this element.

However the RAs still have concerns surrounding the following:

RA concern	Applicant Response
Vehicles removing spoil and delivering on-site approach the site from the Brent Cross area via the A5, A41, Carlton Vale and Kilburn Lane, entering and leaving the site via the Banister Road entrance. The routing shows that vehicles leaving the site will turn left into Banister Road, then left into Chamberlayne Road, then right along the Harrow Road to rejoin the North Circular Road at Stonebridge Park. We object to that because it will add up to a peak of 41 extra HGVs per working day to the existing traffic in Chamberlayne Road, the two pinch-points in the last section of Kilburn Lane and the congested centre of Harlesden. During the first 19 weeks that will be under the existing conditions, after that the unloading bay comes into operation and there will be HGVs as wide as buses competing for space to pass a lorry in the bay. We have asked the applicants why the vehicles cannot simply turn right and return the way they came, via Kilburn Lane and Carlton Vale, etc. They have not rejected that idea but have yet to come up with an answer, or better still, agreement that vehicles can return by that route. Vehicles will be reversed into the site under the control of banksmen. They will be driving forwards when leaving and the banksmen can assist with the right turn if necessary.	The routing of vehicles to and from the site, was agreed through Brent Network Management team. Vehicles arriving from the east and departing from the west was the Council's preferred arrangement. Our highways consultant has put the query to Paul McDonagh in the Network Management Team, and is waiting for a response. From our point of view we are happy to accept either a left or right turn for vehicles exiting the site, so this will be down to Brent Network Management team to advise.
The vehicles using the Chamberlayne Road unloading bay would still need to depart via the Harrow Road. Regarding their arrival, we asked whether a swept path analysis has been done to ensure the vehicles can turn left from Banister	A swept path analysis has been undertaken to demonstrate how HGVs will turn from Banister Road into Chamberlayne Road. This shows that an HGV can make this turn comfortably with the existing stop lines maintained.

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
 Ref: 15/4226 Page 1 of 4

<p>into Chamberlayne without overruling the nearside kerb or coming into conflict with northbound traffic waiting at the lights. Again the applicants have not yet confirmed this. The 316 bus does struggle to make this turn if northbound vehicles have ended up in the cycle box and tight against the centre of carriageway line. On some previous occasion, it was found necessary to temporarily relocate the stop line further back down Chamberlayne Road in order to cater for large HGVs.</p>	
<p>The 3 bays on the west side of Chamberlayne south of the bus stop were originally shown as being "no waiting" and subsequently also "no loading/unloading" only during the proposed operational hours of the unloading bay opposite, i.e. 9:30am to 3:30pm. We seek confirmation that those times will now change to reflect the changes in the operational hours of the unloading bay and that the relevant Traffic Order(s) will be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>The timing of the suspension of these bays will be changed to the new hours of 9:30 – 3:00 and 9:30 – 2:30. The TRO will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>9.30am to 2.30pm for the first 30 weeks 9.30am to 3.00pm for the next 35 weeks 9.30am to 2.30pm for the last 10 weeks</p>
<p>The 7 or 8 bays outside Chamberlayne Mansions are heavily used and those vehicles have to park somewhere. We wish to ensure that the resident users have been made aware of alternative places for them to park, particularly if the only alternative spaces happen to be in a different zone, which will require special arrangements, as was done for vehicles displaced by the Thames water mains replacement work which were allowed to use an adjacent zone.</p>	<p>We have undertaken an updated parking survey to understand the impact of the suspension of parking bays, and the results of this have just been received. IT shows that there is more than sufficient capacity to accommodate any displaced parking from the suspended bays. This information will be provided to officers this afternoon who will be able to draw conclusions from this.</p>
<p>We understand that as well as businesses being able to use the unloading bay during operational hours when unloading is not taking place, it would be possible for a single delivery vehicle to share the bay with the lorry. We understand that marshalls will be present to supervise the bay and to control and direct traffic, and to try and prevent unlawful parking by delivery drivers and minicabs (there is a minicab office amongst the shops). However they do not have statutory powers to control traffic and should there be ongoing problems, we have suggested that Brent should permanently allocate a Traffic Warden to the site when unloading is taking place to enforce the regulations and keep traffic moving. The applicants have indicated that they would likely be prepared to defray any addition cost that might be incurred in providing that facility.</p>	<p>The provision of a dedicated parking enforcement officer is something that only Brent Council can consider. We have raised with officers as a suggestion. We would be happy to discuss how this might work in practice. We will have our own dedicated site operatives who will manage deliveries within the loading bay, and ensure that traffic on Chamberlayne Road continues to run smoothly.</p>
<p>The use of Chamberlayne Road for the unloading bay requires the southbound bus stop to be moved about 35 metres south, but not the shelter, which although providing fairly minimal shelter from the weather does also provide seating. From observation this stop is regularly used throughout the day by elderly and infirm persons, therefore we would ask that arrangements are made with TfL to either move the shelter along with the stop, or provide a temporary shelter, in order to give some protection for the more vulnerable, particularly as the project will encompass two winters.</p>	<p>It is not normal practice to move bus stop shelters, or provide temporary shelters, and this is a TfL issue, however, given the length of time involved here, we have been in touch with TfL to see if they would accept a temporary shelter.</p>

While the westbound bus stop in Banister Road does not move, the shelter is going to be removed to allow demolition of the site wall. Again this stop is regularly used by the elderly and infirm who would be affected by the removal of the shelter for an unspecified period. This shelter also contains a CIS display. Our suggestion is that as the shelter is going to be uprooted, it is not taken away but turned round to be back-to-the-road. This would be the same configuration as most of the other stops in the area and would actually provide greater protection. Also to put the shelter back against the site boundary might interfere with the access to, or windows of, the retail units in the ground floor of the development. We ask that the council also take this up with TfL before the shelter is removed.

It is not possible to retain this bus stop shelter, due to the proximity of the footpath and roadway, to the development site. However, having discussed with our construction team, they are looking at accommodating some sort of shelter beneath the scaffold of the development.

2. Further supporting information

The Applicant has provided further supporting information including additional traffic management design drawings and visual animations of HGVs.

3. Transport for London (TFL)

A letter has been received from TFL in respect of the proposed off site loading bay on Chamberlayne Road and amendments to bus facilities. The letter outlines why TFL consider Chamberlayne Road the most suitable location for the loading bay.

TFL have considered Chamberlayne Road, Banister Road and Kilburn Lane. In their assessment TFL have given consideration to the following:

- Road safety
- Frequency and reliability of services
- Ability to relocate bus stops in order to minimise disruption to services
- Maintaining existing routes and avoiding diversions
- Maintaining convenience to bus passengers
- Avoiding additional mitigation and associated costs to accommodate bus diversion
- Duration of temporary arrangements

Chamberlayne Road:

- The proposed facilities on Chamberlayne Road require no diversion of existing bus services
- The relocation of the bus stop on Chamberlayne Road represents a minimal change to the existing arrangements
- TFL's view is that the proposed suspension of three parking bays opposite the proposed loading bay on the western side of Chamberlayne Road will increase the effective road width, and the developer has provided sufficient width to enable unhindered access for a bus into the bus cage. On the eastern side of Chamberlayne Road access for buses into the bus cage will also be improved as buses will not be required to manoeuvre around parked cars.
- The bus cage on the western side of Chamberlayne Road is maintained in its current location, whilst on the eastern side the bus cage is moved only 35 metres to the north. These changes will cause negligible inconvenience to bus passengers.
- In order to prevent delays to bus services during the morning and evening peak periods the developer has agreed to limit use of the loading bay to avoid morning and evening peak periods. During peak times buses will operate normally.

Banister Road:

- In order to facilitate the loading bay bus stops on either side of Banister Road would have to be removed and relocated. Relocation of either bus stops east along Banister Road is not considered acceptable, on the basis that it would be required for a period of approximately 18 months, cause inconvenience to bus passengers and require suspension of existing parking bays.
- More importantly TFL consider that the occupation of a HGV in a loading bay on Banister Road would cause significant delays to all traffic (including bus services) at the signalised junction of Chamberlayne

Road/ Banister Road. As a consequence TFL consider that in order to maintain service reliability diversion of bus services along Harvist Road would be necessary. This is not acceptable for an 18 month period, since an alternative and preferred solution exists by locating the loading bay on Chamberlayne Road.

Kilburn Lane:

- From a bus perspective a loading bay on Kilburn Lane would be an acceptable solution since it would not require any diversion of bus services or relocation of bus stops. It is accepted, however, that Kilburn Lane is a residential street with significant levels of residential parking, and that to accommodate HGV traffic it would (i) have to be converted to one way operation and (ii) require the suspension of residential parking bays for an 18 month period.

Recommendation: Remains approval

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

16/0169

Location	Land at the Junction of Brondesbury Park & Christchurch Ave, Christchurch Avenue, London
Description	Demolition of existing single storey nursery building and erection of a part three part four storey building to provide educational accommodation for use by Marylebone Boys' School for a temporary period of 2 years until September 2018, with associated works to include fenced multi-games area (MUGA), car and cycle parking spaces, creation of vehicular and pedestrian access, boundary alterations and hard and soft landscaping

Agenda Page Number: 27

Members visited the site on 5th March 2016 and viewed the site from Christchurch Avenue and Brondesbury Park.

Members raised two queries in respect of the relationship of the school with Marada House:

1. Relationship between the school and Marada House

Members queried whether the windows in the flank of the the school would be obscured glazed to prevent loss of privacy to Marada House. The applicant has confirmed the windows on that elevation will be obscured glazed and a condition shall be imposed to that effect.

Members also queried the visual impact of that flank elevation on the outlook of residents of Marada House. The elevation is articulated, with a set back at fourth floor and a small projection for the stair case, along with windows and a changing elevational treatment whilst a retained tree will serve to break up the mass of the block; therefore you officers are satisfied that this temporary structure will not have a materially harmful impact on the outlook of neighbouring residents.

2. Additional objection

One additional objection has been received since the publication of the committee report resulting in a total of three objections from residents and an objection from Cllr Shaw.

This most recent objection raises the following concerns:

- Impact of another school on noise, parking and the peaceful enjoyment of the area.
- The proposal does not benefit residents of Brent.
- The distance of the school from Westminster will lead to many more parents dropping their children off and picking them up by car.
- There are existing traffic problems around Mallorees and on Salusbury Road and Brondesbury Park.
- The site offers visual amenity for the local community and sanctuary for urban wildlife.
- Object to any tree being removed or harmed for a temporary development.
- A four floor building will change the character of the site and is too high and dense.
- Cheap modular construction does nothing to ameliorate the aesthetics of our built environment, nor is it environmentally sustainable
- Its not clear what will happen to the site once the school no longer need the facility which is important as this application could set a precedent for future development.

The committee report discusses these points specifically including the detailed Travel Plan and assessment of the school children's current modes of transport to current the Kilburn site. Para's 20-29 of the report include a review and assessment of the detailed transport information submitted and conclude that the proposal will not result in an unacceptable impact on the public highway, subject to the continued implementation of the Travel Plan.

While the removal of lesser quality trees is agreed trees around the boundary of the site are to be retained and it is vital that their root protection areas are well protected during construction. It is required by condition that all details be agreed with Brent's Tree Protection Officer.

Regarding the scale of the building, while the proposal is much larger than the existing building on the site the committee report sets out its relationship with the siting and scale of adjacent buildings and how it fits acceptably into this context.

On the topic of sustainability the applicant has confirmed that they are happy to provide further information regarding how the Mayor's lean, clean and green hierarchy of carbon reduction has been considered, to maximise the efficiency as far as reasonable in a temporary building. A condition was proposed in the original report to seek this detail.

For clarity once the school has relocated to its permanent site it is required that the temporary building be removed. This requirement is set out in recommended condition 1 which reads as:

This permission shall be for a limited period, expiring on 30th September 2018 after which the buildings and works hereby approved shall be removed and the property reinstated in accordance with details and a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to 30th September 2018.

The submitted details will be expected to include further detail tree protection measures.

3. Bus capacity:

TfL have yet to confirm whether there is likely to be an impact on the capacity of bus routes serving the school however this is expected in the next few days. In the event that there is harmful impact on bus capacity then mitigation measures can include financial contributions to improve capacity. The Department for Education have made provision for this type of mitigation in the Free Schools programme however Officers propose a condition be imposed to ensure this matter is resolved before occupation of the school. The condition is proposed to be worded in such a way that in the event there is no need for mitigation measures then the condition can be discharged.

4. Additional conditions:

Windows:

The windows on the side elevation facing Marada House shall be obscured glazed and non-opening below 1.7m and shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: in the interests of amenity of neighbouring residents

Bus capacity:

Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority:

(a) prior to occupation of the Development a Bus Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Transport for London and shall include details of:

- (i) a Bus Capacity Assessment being an assessment of the impact of this Development on the capacity of bus routes serving this Development; and
- (ii) in the event that the Bus Capacity Assessment identifies a shortfall in capacity on the bus route(s) serving this Development as a result of this development, the Bus Strategy shall set out the Bus Capacity Enhancements including a scope of mitigation works and schedule for implementation of the Bus Capacity Enhancements if required.

(b) In the event that the Bus Capacity Assessment identifies a shortfall in capacity on the bus route(s) serving this Development as a result of this development, prior to occupation of the Development the applicant shall enter into an appropriate agreement with Transport for London, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Transport for London, to directly implement or otherwise fund the Bus Capacity Enhancements in accordance with the approved scope of works and schedule for implementation within the approved Bus Strategy.

Reason: In the interests of public transport accessibility

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to conditions and resolution of bus capacity

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/0406

Location College of North West London, Priory Park Road, London, NW6 7UJ
Description Retention of a 2.4 m high fence with associated doors to the building

Agenda Page Number:

Members visited the site on Saturday 5th March 2016 and viewed the site from Priory Park Road.

The following query was raised by Members:

1. CONFIRM OWNERSHIP OF STRIP OF LAND

Members sought confirmation on the ownership of the strip of land that exists between the application site and Ryde House. Following the sale of the site to the school the strip of land remained in the ownership of Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) and still does. Originally BHP had objected to the application but subsequently withdrew the application following negotiations with the applicant.

Recommendation: Remains approval

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 06

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/4496

Location	Land East of Victoria Centre, Acton Lane, London
Description	Outline planning permission for erection six storey building comprising 103 self-contained one bed apartments as supported housing units (Use Class C2) with associated community facilities

Agenda Page Number:

Members visited the site on Saturday 5th March 2016 and viewed the site from the front and the rear.

Members raised the following queries:

1. PARKING

Members raised concerns regarding the proposed parking arrangement at the facility. The facility was originally proposed to be car-free however parking can be found in the Central Middlesex Hospital to the rear of the proposed facility.

There are two car parks present in the Central Middlesex Hospital: Carpark 1 and Carpark 2. Parking is available Monday to Sunday 24 hours a day in Carpark 1 and is available Monday to Sunday from 7:30 to 20:30 in Carpark 2. The parking charges are laid out below:

1 hour £2.40
2 hours £4.60
5 hours £6.00
8 hours £9.20
24 hours £12.00
3 day pass £18.00
5 day pass £22.00
7 day pass £28.00

Members raised concerns with the lack of disabled and visitor parking available. In response to this the agent has submitted revised plans which propose two car parking spaces located to the rear of the building, adjacent to the proposed loading bay. However due to the lack of a footpath in this area and concerns with safety officers recommend a condition restricting the use of these parking spaces to visiting staff members and visitors and not disabled drivers. Disabled drivers can avail of free parking in the Hospital carpark which has footpaths and safer access than the rear of the proposed building.

In the original scheme ref: 08/1043 parking was previously provided for 35 cars including two disabled car parking spaces for plots 1, 2 and 3. An application for reserved matters ref: 09/2415, which included access, was approved and 11 car parking spaces were designated for plot 3 within the central courtyard area.

2. ADDITIONAL VISITOR ROOMS

Members raised concerns with the availability of overnight visitor accommodation at the Care Home which currently proposes one visitor suite. In response to this point the agent has stated that as the units are affordable and that the majority of residents will be from Brent or the surrounding boroughs that the need for additional visitor accommodation is not projected to be significant. However if the requirement to provide more visitor accommodation arose then a number of the one bed flats could be converted into visitor accommodation quite easily.

The management of the facility can assess whether there is a need for more visitor accommodation and manage the situation accordingly. It is therefore proposed that this matter is left to the discretion of management who will be able to gauge the potential need for any additional visitor accommodation.

The Care Home is aimed at older individuals who require residential and nursing care but also older

Document Imaged

DocSuppF
Ref: 15/4496 Page 1 of 2

individuals within existing residential care homes that could be better supported in more independent accommodation such as Extra Care. The Extra Care accommodation has been proposed for four main groups:

- Some people living in Residential Care
- People with learning disability living in Residential Care
- People with mild to moderate dementia
- People with physical disability
-

The proposed accommodation is not focussed on end of life care but rather providing individuals with assistance whilst allowing them to remain living in their own home as independently as possible with access to their local community.

3. ACCESS FROM REAR OF SITE

Members raised concerns regarding access to the proposed building from the rear and to give it greater prominence as visitors to the care home would enter from this side of the building due to the location of the hospital carpark to the rear. In response to this the agent has outlined that the front entrance is particularly important and will be staffed due to security concerns for the residents of the Care Home. This centres on the fact that some residents suffer from dementia and it is therefore very important to have a clear and principle secure entrance and exit. Multiple entrances that are not managed properly could result in the likelihood of a new visitor to the Care Home leaving a door open allowing access to the outside to vulnerable residents.

The rear door is proposed to be used by staff mainly and will be managed accordingly with devices such as door bells, videophone and a connection with the main desk to ensure security. Therefore no changes are proposed to the rear entrance. This would also conform to advice from Transport Officers who have stated that the introduction of pedestrian activity to the rear of the building would be a concern in the absence of footway links and due to the presence of a loading bay. The rear entrance would therefore be more suited to deliveries and depositing refuse and as such your officers consider the entrance in its current form is the most suitable arrangement.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION:

A condition regarding securing the affordable nature of the accommodation was omitted in error and has now been included.

A condition is also proposed to control the use of the two proposed car parking bays.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to new conditions

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 07

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/4559

Location	Community Centre, Crystal House, 2 Agate Close, London, NW10 7FJ
Description	Variation of condition 23 (to allow the change of use of the ground floor from a doctor's surgery into a day nursery Use class D1) of full planning permission reference 04/0401 dated 26/04/2005 for Demolition of Guinness Sports and Social Club building and 2 squash courts and redevelopment of land to West of Abbeyfields Close and to rear (South) of Abbeyfields Close and Moyne Place to provide a total of 192 residential units (80 affordable) and community facility, doctors' surgery and childcare facility.

Agenda Page Number:

Planning Conditions set for the original permission are required to be added to this new permission since it is a s73 to vary the original consent. For the purposes of presenting a concise Committee report, only the specific Conditions affected by the proposed change of use have been cited within. Nonetheless, the s73 will replicate all Conditions from the original consent, 04/0401, with alterations to those conditions which have had details discharged.

Recommendation: Remains Approval

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 09

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/5394

Location Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley
Description Reserved matters application in relation to outline planning permission 14/3054. This application relates to Plots NW07 and NW08 for the construction of two buildings with two cores each ranging from 2 to 17 storeys in height, providing 361 residential units (within private, intermediate and affordable rented tenures), with private communal residential landscaped gardens, 59 car parking spaces for residential use, and 3,578 sqm (GEA) of commercial space for either Class A1 or A2 (Retail), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking establishments), A5 (Hot food takeaway), B1 (Business) and/or D2 (Leisure and Entertainment), ancillary space, and associated plant, cycle storage for 584 bicycles, refuse provision and associated infrastructure including the creation of "West Olympic Way".

The application has been submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (Layout, Scale, Appearance, Access and Landscaping); 8(c) Layout details; 8 (8(d) Highways layout; 8(e) Cycle storage; part condition 8(f) Parking (excluding allocation); 8(h) Access; 8(i) Daylight; 8(k) Wind); 9 (Noise); 12 (Noise); 20 (Vehicular access); 23 (Sustainability Implementation Strategy); 28 (Affordable Housing Storage).

This application also provides information pursuant to the S106 obligations below, with regard to Plots NW07 and NW08:

4: Affordable Housing, 10.5 Demolition, 12 Sport and Play Space, 19 Brent Access Forum.

Agenda Page Number 115:

At the Committee Site Visit, clarification was requested on a number of matters which are detailed below.

Clarification regarding relationship between building and Olympic Way

The proposed building in Plot NW08 will be sited approximately 5 m from the edge Olympic Way. Olympic Way is approximately 30 m wide. The central 20 m is required to allow egress for Stadium crowds. This leaves a space of 5 m between the pedestrian flow and the sides of Olympic Way. The lower (commercial) element of NW08 will therefore be 10 m from the pedestrian flow. Consequently the proposal will not have any significant effect on stadium crowd flows and is considered acceptable.

Concern regarding Use Class A4 premises fronting on to the new street (West Olympic Way) due to potential noise and disturbance of residents.

Quintain has confirmed that they will accept a condition which specifies that Use Class A4 uses cannot be brought forward within the units fronting "West Olympic Way" unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council.

It was suggested that one of the units should be specifically proposed for community uses.

Currently the application proposes retail (A1-A4), B1 and D2 uses for a number of units on West Olympic Way. They are all relatively small in size and are generally not considered suitable for general community use, such as a community hall. A community hall is also being constructed at present by Quintain within "Alto". However, Quintain community consider that a community based use such as a charity occupier of the B1 space, an opticians, pharmacy or dentist, would be appropriate within one of the units. They have specified that they would accept a general condition to identify a community based use (unless otherwise agreed with the Council).

Yellow pavilion

The following information has been provided by Quintain in relation to the yellow pavilion.

Document Imaged

*DocSuppF
Ref: 15/5394 Page 1 of 2*

The Yellow Pavilion is a social space for the community in and around Wembley Park. There is a drop-in session on Wednesdays when people can come in, see the space, and talk to us about their ideas and as a result, we have a growing programme of activity arranged by local people, for local people, ranging from exercise classes and arts and crafts, to mental health services and jobsearch.

Prior to the completion of the permanent community hall in NW06 which is currently under construction, and following the commencement of construction for NW07/08 (an overlap of around 18 months), the intention is that the unoccupied space within Forum House will be fitted out by Quintain and used as a replacement community venue. The facility in Forum House will be in operation for around 18 months.

NB. The unoccupied space in Forum House referred to above, is the Creche space that is accessed from Lakeside Way. It was intended to be provided as a nursery but has planning permission for general D1 usage. The fitting out of this unit to provide the temporary (18 months) of general community space would help to ensure that the space can be let as in the future as the high fit-out costs, which include the provision of a platform lift for disabled users, have reportedly deterred some potential occupiers of the space.

Quintain have specified that the Yellow Pavilion is not sufficiently robust to be moved within Wembley Park again and is unlikely to stand being moved to another site. However, they are prepared to review this with another organisation with a suitable site who can undertake the removal and reconstruction works directly.

PRS units

The PRS units will be operated by a wholly owned subsidiary of Quintain known as Tipi. It is intended that the PRS units will remain a rented product in perpetuity.

Servicing from Olympic Way

A statement has been received from Quintain confirming that they accept a condition that the use of Olympic Way for vehicles will be prohibited unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in decision notice and additional conditions to secure (unless otherwise agreed in writing):

- restriction of the use of the commercial units fronting "West Olympic Way" to exclude Use Class A4;
- the approval of a revised servicing plan which excludes the use of Olympic Way by vehicles; and the approval of details of a "community" use within one of the non-residential units,

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 10

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/4523

Location	Byron Court Primary School, Spencer Road, Wembley, HA0 3SF
Description	Demolition of eight existing buildings on site comprising 4x teaching blocks, 1x shelter, 1x shed, 1x storage/garage and 1x kitchen and dining facilities and construction of new part single and part two storey building (to accommodate expansion of the school from 3 form to 5 form entry primary school), all-weather MUGA to include the reconfiguration of the School's playing field and associated landscaping and parking, upgrading of the Nathans Road access and temporary permission for the erection of a single teaching block (2x classrooms) for use until July 2017.

Agenda Page Number:

Members site visit

Members visited the site on Saturday 5 March 2016. Approximately 40 residents present and Councillor Perrin. The site was viewed from the Spencer Road entrance, Nathan's Road entrance and within the school site. Local roads viewed from the bus, including the roads around the school, the route to Northwick Park car park and the routes to East Lane and Watford Road;

Residents highlighted a number of issues including:

Highways

- **Narrow nature of streets**

This is acknowledged, particularly in the cases of Spencer Road and Abbots Drive.

- **Concern regarding traffic flows during the day and evening (up to 5 / 6 pm)**

Weekday traffic flows and speeds for Nathans Road and Spencer Road were surveyed by the applicant and are contained at tables 5.32 and 5.33 of the Transport Assessment. Peak two-way flows of 95 cars on Nathans Road in the morning peak (8-9am) and 105 cars on Spencer Road in the morning peak. Flows on both roads through the rest of the day are very light.

- **Inconsiderate parking in front of and in driveways, with residents abused by parents (one resident erected CCTV as the issues were so significant)**

Officers are aware of the inappropriate parking that is taking place as discussed above. This matter has been discussed within paragraphs 129 to 130 of the main committee report.

- **Hospital staff, visitors and commuters already park in the local streets**

Commuter parking has been discussed within paragraphs 135 to 139 of the main committee report.

- **The informal one-way system is not enforced**

This is noted. As it is informal, so there is no current means of enforcing it at present.

- **There is grid-lock at the slightest hiccup on the road network**

Difficulties have been observed, such as when vehicles travel against the prevailing flow, particularly in Spencer Road but also in Norval Road.

- **Emergency vehicles can't access the area during drop-off and pick-up times**

Emergency vehicles travelling with blue lights and sirens can still gain access, but it is acknowledged that

Document Imaged

*DocSuppF
Ref: 15/4523 Page 1 of 6*

they would be slowed in their response time when streets are congested.

- **Traffic has to go through the estate to get to the walking bus drop-off location**

This is acknowledged. Traffic from the west can use Norval Road as far as The Fairway.

- **The committee should walk the walking bus route;**

The committee members viewed the location of the walking bus route on the coach.

- **Not a sustainable development as people need to drive to the school;**

Public transport options are not plentiful, but there is a nearby station. Details of the proposed modal split has been provided within the School Travel Plan (refer to paragraphs 140 to 145 of the main committee report).

- **Visibility splays for Nathan's Road access have not provided;**

The access from Nathans Road is an existing access, but has not been used by the school for a number of years. Your officers in Transportation have advised the maximum visibility requirement is 2.4m x 23m for a 20mph road, which can be easily achieved without altering the boundary fence. There are speed cushions either side of the crossover which are within 30m of the site to keep speeds to about 20mph, thus reducing the stopping distance. Transportation have also requested a speed table outside the entrance which will extend to the adjoining properties and the opposite driveways and this will further help manage the speed outside the entrance.

A reduction in fence height to 600mm to improve pedestrian sightlines would be welcome, but is not essential.

The existing crossover extends to serve the adjoining two properties and therefore provides one long crossover. As such, kerb radii are not required as vehicles making a turn into the lightly trafficked site access would be using the crossover and not overrunning the footway.

Margins of 450mm width should be provided along both sides of the access to protect the adjoining fences. It is recommended that this is secured via a planning condition.

- **Construction traffic, service vehicles and coaches won't be able to use the Nathan's Road access, and the parking that takes place on Nathan's Road will also result in this access not working**

Tracking diagrams have been provided in the Construction Management Plan to demonstrate that access can be achieved from Nathans Road by tipper trucks, cement mixers and mobile cranes (no articulated lorries are proposed to access the site). The need for temporary waiting restrictions at bends and junctions has been identified in a number of areas to ease turning. These are shown on the tracking diagrams at the back of the Construction Management Plan.

For the permanent school, fire appliances and refuse vehicles would be able to turn into and out of the access without difficulty, but coaches would not unless waiting restrictions are installed opposite the access - thus removing an on-street parking space. However, coach visits are no likely to be frequent, so it may not be worthwhile to install waiting restrictions in this area. Officers in Transportation have advised that this can be considered further as part of the overall highway improvement works.

- **The condition of the local roads is already poor due to the impact of large vehicles;**

Officers in Transportation have advised that they are not aware of the roads being in a poor condition and there are therefore no major resurfacing planned for the area for the forthcoming year. If there are particular pothole problems, these can be reported on our website.

- **Accidents have already occurred due to the level of traffic for the existing school;**

The personal accident record has been examined in the TA and is covered in the committee report. There was only one personal injury accident recorded over five years - at the junction of Spencer Road and Abbotts Drive.

- **The Council ignored the resident's own surveys;**

All information provided by residents was taken into consideration.

- **Site visit should have taken place on a week day to see traffic issues**

Your officers in Transportation did carry out site visits during the school pick up and drop off times. The findings have been discussed within paragraph 129 of the main committee report

- **Not clear what changes to the local highways are proposed and these affect local residents;**

A list of the improvement works is set out within paragraph 146 of the main committee report. Further information is discussed below.

- **Distance for walking buses is excessive and not practical;**

Only one walking bus is proposed from Northwick Park Car Park. The use of a walking bus from this location is considered acceptable by officers in Transportation

General

- **School is no longer "Excellent" and shouldn't be expanded**

This matter has already been discussed within the main committee report. Please refer to pages 192 and 193.

- **Community functions will take place between 6:30 and 11pm and will impact on residents**

As discussed within the main committee report, community access is proposed to the MUGA , sports hall and the small hall. The MUGA will not be flood lit so that this will restrict its usage particularly during winter months. Community access will be managed through a Community Access Plan. The school currently does not have any conditions restricting the hours of use for community access. The proposed hours are comparable to other schools within the borough and it is not expected that this level of community use will result in significant levels of traffic or disturbance of local residents.

- **A single attenuation tank is proposed on one side of the school. This will not provide drainage for the other side of the school**

The Flood risk considerations of the proposal have been discussed within paragraphs 101 to 108 of the main committee report. The level of attenuation has been reviewed by the Local Lead Flood Authority and considered to be acceptable.

Character and impact on adjoining properties

- **Buildings will overshadow adjoining gardens**

The impact of the new school building and the temporary classroom has already been discussed within paragraphs 34 to 41 of the main committee report.

- **Buildings large and out of scale**

The design of the new school building has already been discussed within paragraphs 24 to 29 of the main committee report.

- **Structural impact of large vehicles (including construction traffic) on local houses**

Your officers in building control have advised that the road network is designed to accommodate larger vehicles so that they do not have a structural impact on neighbouring houses.

One parent attended in support

- **The school has been taking steps to improve things and these are working.**

Comments are noted.

Councillor Perrin raised the following issues:

- **The school cannot keep to their existing Travel Plan and won't keep to the proposed one -**

Officers in Transportation have advised that the School's Travel Plan is silver accredited, showing a good level of engagement. However, this will need to be improved for the expanded school.

- **The proposed Travel Plan is insufficient**

Officers in Transportation have advised that the Travel Plan generally meets standards. They have advised that more emphasis on the park and stride option, centred around Northwick Park, with more ambitious targets is required. This has already been discussed within the main committee report.

- **The Northwick Park car park will not be able to accommodate the large number of cars, getting them in and out in 20 minutes**

The car park has 96 marked spaces and Highways have advised that with a walking bus in operation and a 5-minute set down period, this could potentially turn over about 300 vehicles in 20 minutes (assuming practical peak occupancy of 80%).

- **The car park is only open from dawn to dusk and cannot serve throughout the year**

The car park is open at least from 8am-6pm, so can serve the school without difficulty

- **Construction traffic is to turn right onto Watford Road, but cannot do so as there is a no right turn sign**

There is indeed a "no right turn" restriction at the junction of Watford Road and The Green, preventing traffic turning from Watford Road (south) into The Green. Construction traffic would need to be directed to access The Green from the north. Alternatively, the direction of flow of construction traffic could be reversed. This needs further thought as part of the future sign off of the final Construction Management Plan. This has already been recommended to be secured as a condition.

Members queried a number of the points raised above. In addition to this, the following points were raised:

- **The Highways improvements should be clearly set out and shown on a plan**

The improvements are listed in a table at present within paragraph 146 of the main committee, and include:

- a raised table outside the access on to Nathans Road;
- a zebra crossing to enable safer pedestrian access to the Nathans Road entrance;
- a segregated footway alongside the access road to the Northwick Car Park; and
- a covered waiting area for the Northwick Car Park.

The table within paragraph 146 also refers to the "implementation of traffic measures". It was recognised that vehicles travelling against the flow of the voluntary one way system causes undue congestion which also impacts on other junctions. Highways accordingly recommended that a review is undertaken of vehicle movements on the surrounding streets and the existing one-way system is formalised. The traffic measures would involve the formalisation of the one-way system as a minimum.

- **Has a breakdown been provided of the wider routes for traffic be provided, including traffic numbers (i.e. from East Lane & Watford Road)**

The applicant has advised that the sphere of influence for surveys that was agreed with the Council's Transportation Department covered the parking survey area, as outlined in the Transport Assessment [Abbotts Drive east of The Fairway, Nathans Road north of Carlton Ave West, Norval Road east of The Fairway, Spencer Road and The Fairway north of Abbots Drive]. They advise that the Council's Transportation Department did not consider an assessment of the impact of traffic movements in the local or wider area to be necessary. The subsequent assignment of vehicular movements under various mitigation scenarios was based on the assumption of an even distribution of traffic between the south (Nathans Road, from East Lane) and the west (Norval Road, from Watford Road). The resulting peak hour traffic movements

are shown in Appendices B and C of the Transport Assessment, with this impact expected to disperse further outside the investigated area. The impact on East Lane and Watford Road is expected to be within existing daily variation.

- **What is the walking distance from the Northwick Park car park and the school?**

Just over 500m.

- **Has a remote drop-off location with shuttle bus to the school been considered?**

The applicant has advised that the use of shuttle school buses from a "park & ride" location was looked at but was not considered a suitable measure for a primary school, given the local catchment which provides suitable opportunities for walking and cycling / scooting. Instead park & stride measures are considered more suitable to reduce existing traffic impact, as proposed at Northwick Park car park, as well as walking bus proposals.

What types and sizes of construction vehicles will be used? Can these access the site?

Only rigid lorries are proposed to be used and tracking diagrams have been produced to show they can access the site. Some temporary waiting restrictions will be required.

- **Clarification on the wider routes for construction traffic.**

The Construction Management Plan shows indicative routes from the North Circular Road and the A40 to the site. The construction access routes will need to be reviewed given the right-turn ban at Watford Road/The Green. Further details are recommended to be conditioned.

- **Would the introduction of a CPZ in the local streets help?**

Your officers in Transportation have advised that a CPZ could help to remove some of the all-day commuter parking, thus helping to free up two-way traffic flow in the area. The impact will depend on the hours of operation. Alternatively, a one-hour restriction could be used (possibly 8-9am on one side of streets in the morning and 3-4pm on the other side in the afternoon), if residents aren't supportive of paying for permits.

- **Will the new school buildings result in significant noise for surrounding residents which could affect home workers and others**

Noisy construction works will be restricted to 08.00 to 18.00 Mondays to Fridays and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays with no noisy works on Sundays and Bank Holidays. This is in line with Environmental Health legislation.

When the school buildings are occupied, there will be playgrounds for the younger year groups in close proximity to neighbouring gardens. However, the level of noise from this activity is considered typical for a school building and will only be for periods throughout the day. Likewise as the MUGA will not be flood lit, it will only be available for use during daylight hours. The houses surrounding the school have long rear gardens in the region of

A condition is secured for plant equipment to be below background noise level.

- **What screen planting is proposed along the northern and eastern boundaries?**

The proposal includes new screen planting and tree planting (13 trees) along the northern boundary and 7 trees around the MUGA on the eastern and southern boundary. Full details of the landscaping, including the screen planting, is to be secured through conditioning.

- **Can a covered walkway be provided between the school buildings?**

A covered walkway is proposed between the existing and new building. It is illustrated on the roof plan. It is positioned at the western end of the new playground adjacent to the car park to minimise disruption to the marked areas on the playground.

Additional comments from the Sudbury Court Residents Association (SCRA)

Cllr Perrin and the SCRA have advised that the list of signatories to the objection was not intended as a petition. It was a list of residents who object to the planned expansion, gave their views, and these were collated into one document. They have explained that those people who signed put many hours of work into reading the 60+ documents issued as part of the planning application, attending meetings to give their views, researching sections of the documentation, carrying out traffic surveys, counting cars, and writing huge sections of the objection letter, they were not merely signatories to a petition.

They have advised that the objective was to submit one objection letter, with supporting signatures, so that the Council could focus on the points raised, rather than spending time having to wade through many hundreds of letters saying similar things.

Officers confirm that the way the objections were raised has assisted in the clarity of local resident's concerns. The concerns raised by these objectors have been taken into account and considered within the main committee report which allows members to take these objections into account. The reference to it as a petition does not diminish the weight given to the objections or the fact that a very large number of people are objecting to the proposals on the grounds that have been raised. When considering this application, members will clearly be aware of the significant level of public objection to this application.

The Council's standard procedure when a petition is submitted or if a standard template letter from multiple contacts is received, is to record the comments as 'PETITION received', either against the contact details of the Head Petitioner / Original Author of standard template letter. As the letter was submitted by the SCRA, we recorded it under their name rather than sending it to individual signatories. However, the extent of the people signing to object is fully recognised.

Letter received from Barry Gardiner (Member of Parliament for Brent North)

A letter has been received from Barry Gardiner requested that members visit the site during a week day at peak times to allow members to under the severe traffic congestion that arise during this time. In response your officers can advise that while it is clearly important that the Planning Committee fully understands the nature of highway and traffic concerns, it is not considered necessary for the site visit to take place when these conditions are being experienced. The Council's Highways service visited the site on multiple instances to observe the traffic conditions and have provided information regarding this and taken these observations into account when providing their views on the proposal. The applicant has also submitted details of observations within the application submission. Traffic conditions have been raised in detail by local residents and the residents association. The observations are discussed within the main committee report.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the conditions as set out after paragraph 148 of the main committee report, and an additional condition relating to margins of 450mm width should be provided along both sides of the access from Nathans Road to protect the adjoining fences.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 11

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 9 March, 2016

Case No.

15/5240

Location	Uxendon Manor Primary School, Vista Way, Harrow, HA3 0UX
Description	Expansion of current 2FE to 4FE primary school with associated landscape works and including: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Demolition of two classroom blocks, sports hall, toilet wing and staff room.2. Construction of new 2 storey block providing 16 classrooms and associated spaces linking to existing building, new single storey providing 4 classrooms and associated spaces in SE corner of the site and a new larger sports hall.3. Internal alterations and remodelling to main school building providing enlarged reception and main entrance, converting existing reception classrooms into new music/dance studio space and upgrading and remodelling of the existing kitchen and dining hall.4. New incoming electrical connection5. Provision of temporary classrooms and toilets for the duration of the works, including creation of services connections

Agenda Page Number: 215

Members Site Visit

Members visited the site on Saturday 5 March 2016. The following queries have been raised:

- Is there any potential for grey-water re-use?

The agent has advised that grey-water use was discounted as an option within the sustainability strategy for Uxendon Manor Primary School because of the relatively low water volume used in the kitchen and sinks. Add to this the intermittent use of the facilities (for example limited by the length of school day and holiday periods) grey-water recycling would not merit the capital cost and use of area for storage/treatment/pump plant. Above all the environmental benefits are low impact in this setting.

Similarly, rain-water harvesting for toilet flushing would require substantial storage and may not serve its purpose as the school WCs flushes are not used on a regular basis, restricted by the school day and school term. In other words, water would be stored that is not required and would eventually overflow to attenuation tanks already providing sustainable drainage.

The scheme does achieve carbon reduction 40% improvement on Part L 2010 Building Regulation, which is comparable to a target of 35% reduction from 2013 Building Regulations, and will achieve BREEAM 'Very Good'. This has been discussed within paragraphs 56 to 68 of the main committee report.

- Have the effects on sewerage infrastructure been considered

This matter is discussed in more detail below.

Additional comments received

An objection has been received by an Urban Drainage consultant raising the following concerns:

- Surcharging of the sewer network above cover levels in this area is well known. The main area affected within the School is cordoned off and sewage litter is present within that area. This area is close to the proposed footpath and the proposed Orchard. Public Health and Sanitation is an issue to be addressed.
- Works carried out directly above the crown of the Sewer i.e. demolition of buildings and subsequent backfilling and soil compacting will impose stresses into the crown of the sewer.

The Lead Local Flooding Authority has provided the following information

At Uxendon Manor School, the applicant has taken into consideration flooding risks and are providing suitable

Document Imaged

*DocSuppF
Ref: 15/5240 Page 1 of 2*

SuDS and proposed discharge from the new school is considerably less than existing. This will reduce the flooding risks. As part of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, we are required to manage flood risks arising from surface water, ordinary watercourses and ground water but not from foul sewer as this is the responsibility of Water Company.

The Lead Local Flooding Authority has been meeting with Thames Water, the Environment Agency and LB Harrow regarding flooding in Harrow and Brent North, with the most recent meeting taking place yesterday. Thames Water are preparing a drainage model to identify the flooding problems and then find suitable solutions. Areas within Brent that are affected include Belvedere Way and Preston Hill and the number of properties affected by internal flooding are very few.

The flooding in this area is combination of foul and surface water and this is mainly due to surface water spillage into foul sewer in Harrow as they have shared manholes. There are also a number of cross connections between foul and surface water.

The main proposals are to separate surface water from foul sewer and provide storage in foul and surface water sewer systems in various locations. There are four areas in Harrow and by implementing schemes in Harrow, this will drastically reduce the flow in Brent and flooding risks will be reduced. The scheme we discussed in Brent is likely to be a storage in Woodcock Park and in Fryent Country Park and this will be mainly a large pond or enlarging existing watercourse. The flooding in Preston park and North Brent is mainly due to foul sewer and Thames Water are exploring the options to provide additional storage.

The following additional queries have been raised by Councillor Colwill.

- **There should be at least 5 holding tanks put in to elevate flooding**

The Local Lead Flood Authority has advised that the scheme has designed the sewer for 1:100 year storm and they have provided adequate storage with controlled discharge.

- **Parking restrictions (one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon) should be included on the roads that lead to the school to allow the roads to be kept clear**

This planning application seeks to introduce a number of waiting restrictions throughout the area to address obstructive parking issues. They are mostly double yellow lines at junctions and turning circles. Your officers in Transportation have also advised that a number of parking restrictions are being considered within the area. These measures include seeking to introduce a 3hr restriction along Woodcock Hill. They have advised that 1 hr restrictions have enforcement implications.

Additional comments have also been received by two residents raising the following:

- **How Brent Council intend to deal with potentially a doubling of traffic in our area**

The Highway considerations of the scheme have already been discussed. Reference should be made to the paragraphs 112 to 123 of the main committee report.

- **Errors on pages 228 and 229 of the main committee report as reference is made to gardens of Vista Way. This is incorrect as it should be rear on Regal Way.**

Your offices can confirm that the report does incorrectly refer to Vista Way within paragraphs 42 to 47. This should be rear gardens of Regal Way. This is a typing error and your officers can confirm that when considering the impact of the proposal, consideration was given to the houses and rear gardens on Regal Way.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the conditions as set out after paragraph 150 of the main committee report.

DocSuppF