

## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 16 January 2013 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Ketan Sheth (Chair), Aden, Baker, Cummins, Hashmi, John, Long (In place of Daly), CJ Patel, RS Patel, Krupa Sheth and Singh.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Daly.

# 1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

None declared.

## 2. Minutes of the previous meeting - 12 December 2012

**RESOLVED:-**

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 December 2012 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

## 3. 10 Rushout Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0AR (Ref. 12/3022)

#### PROPOSAL:

Demolition of detached garage and erection of a four storey four bedroom dwellinghouse including basement, formation of 1 off street parking space and associated landscaping.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

- a) Grant Planning Permission, subject to an appropriate form of Agreement in order to secure the measures set out in the Section 106 Details section of this report, or
- (b) If within a reasonable period the applicant fails to enter into an appropriate agreement in order to meet the policies of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Strategy and Section 106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, to delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning, or other duly authorised person, to refuse planning permission.

Rachel McConnell, Area Planning Manager informed members that the applicant had submitted revised plans which corrected the overhang roof and with that in view, condition 2 had been amended. She clarified that the proposed use which would be for a gymnasium would be incidental to the use of the main residential building. By using quality materials, the proposal would be a successful addition without causing harm to the street scene.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

# 4. 141-153 High Street, London NW10 (Ref. 12/2920)

#### PROPOSAL:

Erection of 3 storey building to provide 13 affordable flats, consisting of 4 one-bedroom, 7 two-bedroom and 2 three-bedroom units.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement, amended Heads of Terms and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

Andy Bates, Area Planning Manager, informed the Committee that the agent had submitted amended drawings which responded to the detailed points and which would be referred to in the decision notice. He added that the amended plans raised no new issues for other parties but dealt with the queries raised by Rucklidge Avenue Residents' Association. He referred to an additional representation received from the neighbour at No. 155 High Street which raised specific issues on the relationship of the proposed building with her property, the need to clarify the boundary, the impact of the flank development to her property, the forward projection of the proposed building and its impact on the visibility of her property.

In response, the Area Planning Manager stated that he understood the matters raised by the neighbour however they were matters outside of the remit of planning control. They would in any event need to be resolved between the parties. In terms of the issue of forward projection, he advised that the matter had already been raised at appeal and the Inspector did not object to this element of the scheme. He however suggested the addition of an informative or a condition for a pre-construction site survey.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended and the addition of a condition or an informative relating to pre-construction site survey.

# 5. Land next to Stonebridge Park Hotel, Hillside, Stonebridge, London NW10 (Ref.12/3026)

#### PROPOSAL:

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

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to amended conditions 7, 8, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21 and 22, additional condition on non-openable windows, revised Heads of Terms, the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning or

other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Director of Legal and Procurement.

Neil McClellan, Area Planning Manager drew members' attention to a number of amendments to conditions as set out in the tabled supplementary report. He also submitted the following responses to concerns raised by residents during the site visit:

In respect of community facilities, he stated that new and improved facilities which included a community hall, PCT Health Clinic, Fawood Nursery and a variety of community rooms had been delivered within the Hillside Hub which adjoined the application site.

He advised that given the decision to remove the high-rise tower blocks and provide the majority of homes as houses with front doors facing streets and private gardens (central to the regeneration of Stonebridge), it was expected that the amount of open space would decrease. He drew members' attention to facilities for children's play areas which were accessible and as such not considered to be segregated from the rest of the estate.

He submitted that the reasons why the height of the buildings was considered acceptable had been discussed in detail in the Committee report and drew members' attention to other buildings within the estate which were in excess of the limit set out in the outline consent.

He considered that insufficient evidence had been put forward thus far by the NHS in its request to secure contributions towards healthcare from the development and that a meeting to discuss Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) requirements would be set up with the NHS to establish whether contributions should be sought from the development in the future.

Mrs Bridget Bainbridge in objecting to the proposed development stated that it would neither protect nor promote the interests of Stonebridge residents if planning permission was granted. She added that Stonebridge residents had expressed their objection to the scheme by submitting a 200 strong signature petition. She gave the principal reasons as follows:- inadequate communal open space, excessive height of the building (9 storey), lack of communal building and visionary landscape, all of which would result in a segregated community. She continued that charges for using the community centres available on the estate were not affordable to most of the residents. Mrs Bainbridge urged the Committee to reject the application until the concerns she had raised had been resolved by the applicant.

Nigel Swanton, the applicant's agent, stated that a number of issues that were initially misunderstood had been clarified in the officer's report. He continued that the community centres on the estate made only notional charges and did not make profits from their operations which were subsidised by Hyde Housing Association. He confirmed that the mix tenure would ensure that in excess of 50% of the units would be given for affordable housing.

In response to members' questions Mr Swanton stated that 4-bedroom properties were not a feature of the scheme as they were neither desirable nor affordable. The car parking spaces had been increased to a level that exceeded parking standards and satisfied the requirements of the Council's Highways section. In his view, the scheme would be quite open with community gardens for use by nearby residents and complied with the Stonebridge master plan in terms of height and open space and the council's SPG17, in terms of sunlight and outlook.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

# 6. Former Guinness Brewery Site, Rainsford Road, Park Royal, NW10 (Ref. 12/2862)

#### PROPOSAL:

Full planning application for Plot 1 for the erection of 3 buildings providing a total of 14,704 sq.m. (GEA) of B1c, B2 and B8 floorspace, including a new access onto Cumberland Avenue and associated car parking, landscaping and ancillary works. Outline application for Plot 2 for the development of up to 28,111 sq.m. (GEA) of B1c, B2 and B8 floorspace with all matters reserved except the first phase of landscaping.

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

Neil McClellan, Area Planning Manager, updated members that since the report was circulated the Greater London Authority (GLA) had confirmed its satisfaction with the application and therefore it would now not be referred to the Mayor's Office for a final decision. He added that the Council's Highways section had raised no issues with the scheme and that the Transportation Unit had suggested conditions to secure the matters set out in the tabled supplementary report. In response to members' questions, the Planning Manager stated that the applicant was eager to progress the scheme and that educational and medical facilities for future occupiers were located in nearby areas.

Neil McClellan advised members that the Section106 financial contribution for this scheme as set out in the committee report was incorrect and that the actual contribution being sought by officers was £800,000.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

## 7. Updated Barnhill and Queen's Park Conservation Design Guide

Members received a report which provided an update on a review of Brent's Conservation Area Design Guides being undertaken with the overall aim of producing up to date documents to give clear guidance primarily to residents on acceptable types of development. The Draft Conservation Area Design Guides for Barnhill and Queen's Park were attached as appendices to the report.

Steve Weeks, Head of Area Planning, outlined the key elements of the design guides for both Barnhill and Queen's Park Conservation areas and added that as well as providing more clarity for residents, the guides would assist the Council in defending a decision where an appeal had been lodged. He continued that there had been discussions with residents groups on the draft Design Guides and the guides were now ready for public consultation to commence at the end of January 2013.

In response to members' questions about the form of consultation, the Head of Area Planning explained that in addition to letters to residents in those areas, a link to the council's website would be provided for on-line responses and that officers would hold drop-in sessions with residents. Consideration would also be given to consultation via Brent Connects Forums (formerly Area Consultative Committees) subject to the timescales of their meeting.

#### RESOLVED:

that the draft Barnhill Conservation Area Design Guide and Queen's Park Conservation Area Design Guide be endorsed for public consultation scheduled to commence at the end of January 2013.

### 8. Appeals 1 November to 31 December 2012

#### **RESOLVED:**

that the schedule of appeals for the period 1 November to 31 December 2012 be noted.

### 9. Date of next meeting

The next meeting would take place on Wednesday 13 February 2013.

## 10. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting ended at 8:00pm

COUNCILLOR KETAN SHETH Chair