



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 13 February 2013 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Ketan Sheth (Chair), Daly (Vice-Chair), Aden, Cummins, Hashmi, Ogunro (In place of John), CJ Patel, RS Patel, Krupa Sheth and Singh

Also present: Councillor Allie.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John.

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

No declarations were made.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 January 2013 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Claremont High School, Claremont Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0UH (Ref. 12/2942)

PROPOSAL: Erection of first floor extension to existing single storey western wing of Claremont High School to form Sixth Form facility comprising three additional classrooms and library at north west of school site.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Rachel McConnell, the Area Planning Manager updated members that a further representation had been received from one of the objectors to the application which reiterated the issue of privacy. In order to address residents' concerns, she recommended an additional condition to ensure that all glazing on the first and second floors of the northern elevation of the extension would be obscure glazed below 1.7m. She drew Members' attention to an amended condition 5 as set out in the supplementary report requiring details of additional landscaping to be planted along the northern boundary to provide screening.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and informatives and additional condition 8.

4. Claremont High School, Claremont Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0UH (Ref. 12/3110)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing single storey store and office and erection of first and second floor extension to existing ground floor girls' gymnasium at north eastern wing of Claremont High school, to form additional accommodation for Sixth Form Facility.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and informatives.

5. 23 & 25 Tudor Gardens, London, NW9 8RL (Ref. 12/3201)

PROPOSAL: Erection of two detached two storey dwellings with associated parking, turning and landscaping at land rear of nos 23 & 25 Tudor Gardens.

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.

Mr Paresh Patel, a local resident stated that residents of Daisy Close had no objection to the application in principle and would be prepared to work with the developer to achieve a scheme that addressed their concerns. These included the following concerns: health and safety, the impact on residents during construction and inadequate lighting to Daisy Close. Mr Patel explained that construction vehicles using Daisy Close would lead to increased traffic which could cause accidents as well as obstruct access to Daisy Close. He continued that, due to the width of Daisy Close, refuse trucks would have difficulty accessing the road during construction, further adding to adverse impact to residents.

In responding to the concerns expressed, Rachel McConnell, Area Planning Manager, stated that Daisy Close residents had dedicated parking spaces and that the access road of 4.8metres in width and turning head would allow refuse vehicles to enter and leave in forward gear. She continued that as Daisy Close was a private road which had not been adopted the Council could not exercise the usual controls but she was confident that as the developer had signed up to the Considerate Constructor Scheme (CCS), they would seek to minimise any impact that may result from the construction of the scheme. Rachel McConnell clarified that high level street lighting would not be appropriate along Daisy Close and the new development site, given that it would be adjacent to residential gardens.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

6. Willesden Green Library Centre, 95 High Road, London, NW10 2SF (Ref. 12/2924)

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of the existing Willesden Green library building, retention of the former library building on the High Road frontage, and the erection of a new Cultural Centre, including cafe and retail space, along with 95 residential flats (46 one and 49 two bed units) to the rear of the site, with associated car parking.

RECOMMENDATION: Defer to a special meeting to comply with the period of statutory notice for re-consultation.

Chris Walker, Assistant Director of Planning and Development informed members that as a result of further legal advice in relation to the period of statutory notice following re-consultation, the application had been recommended for deferral to be considered at the next available meeting. It was noted that residents and interested parties had been notified.

DECISION: Deferred to a special meeting to comply with the period of statutory notice for re-consultation.

7. Willesden Green Library Centre, 95 High Road, London, NW10 2SF (Ref. 12/2925)

PROPOSAL:

Conservation Area consent for partial demolition works to the rear of the old library building to facilitate its link to the proposed Willesden Green Cultural Centre.

RECOMMENDATION: Defer to a special meeting to comply with the period of statutory notice for re-consultation.

See previous item for preamble.

DECISION: Deferred to a special meeting to comply with the period of statutory notice for re-consultation.

8. SKL House, 18 Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1YP (Ref. 12/3089)

PROPOSAL:

Erection of first floor extension to front of building, with alterations to the front forecourt layout, reduction in width to existing vehicle access and change of use from office (B1a) to a mixed use with B1(c) (light industrial), B8 (warehouse & distribution) with ancillary office and kitchen showroom (as amended by revised plans dated 22/01/13).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Chris Walker, Assistant Director of Planning and Development informed the Committee that an additional letter of objection had been received but raised no new issues of concern by residents. In responding to concerns expressed by residents, the Assistant Director stated that the scheme was supported by Transportation Officers and would provide improved servicing arrangements improved vehicle access arrangements and still represented 75% of the maximum parking standards being provided off-street. In respect of facilities for bin and refuse storage, he drew Members' attention to condition 9(a), which required the approval of refuse storage details prior to commencement of the use, thus giving the Council sufficient control over the capacity of refuse storage and its location.

Mr David Stock, Chair of Heather Park Residents' Association, in objecting to the proposal expressed concerns about over-development of the site, inadequate facilities for loading and reduction in off-street parking. He continued that there were no arrangements in place for the storage of bins, raising concerns about health and safety. Mr Stock also added that the scheme had introduced a chimney to the rear of the building of which residents were not previously made aware.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Allie, ward member stated that he had been approached by representatives of the Residents' Association. Councillor Allie stated that the current scheme would give rise to additional traffic movements, traffic congestion and obstruction to emergency vehicles. In his view, these issues could alter the residential character of the Heather Park area.

In the ensuing discussion, Members considered that in view of the concerns expressed by residents, the scheme was flawed. Members felt that the applicant had not assessed the full extent of the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring residential part of Beresford Road nor made clear the end use of the building. In view of these matters, Councillor Hashmi moved an amendment to the recommendation to defer for a site visit to enable Members to assess the full impact of the development on the local residents. Prior to voting, the Assistant Director reiterated that the scheme would be an improvement on the existing situation for the reasons he had outlined in his introduction.

Members voted by a majority to defer the application for a site visit.

DECISION: Deferred for a site visit.

9. Appeals Decision Monitoring: 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

The Committee received a report which sought to simplify information on planning appeals into categories which would enable meaningful comparisons to be made. Members noted that with the general format for the analysis established, officers could identify key issues where further work and assessment was required to better inform the decision making process. The Assistant Director of Planning and Development added that officers intended to carry out further work and provide feedback including a review of enforcement appeals periodically.

In welcoming the monitoring report, Members congratulated officers for providing a useful and informative report on planning appeals.

RESOLVED:

that the appeals monitoring report be noted.

10. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting ended at 7:45pm

COUNCILLOR KETAN SHETH
Chair