



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Tuesday 21 April 2015 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Marquis (Chair), Colacicco (Vice-Chair), Agha, S Choudhary, Filson, Hylton, Kansagra and Mahmood

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Harbi Farah, Councillor Michael Pavey and Councillor Carol Shaw

Apologies for absence were received from

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

4. Olympic Office Centre Car Park (Plot C), Rutherford Way, Wembley.

All members declared that they had received promotional booklets from the applicant.

5. Playground, Silver Jubilee Park Townsend Lane (Ref. 14/4971)

All members declared that they had received copies of the petition. Councillor Agha added that he had been contacted by residents in connection with the application.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting - 1 April 2015**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 1 April 2015 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. **Flats 1-6 INC, 84 Bowrons Avenue, Wembley, HA0 4QR (Ref. 14/4732)**

PROPOSAL: Erection of roof extension to existing three storey block of flats to form 2 new self-contained flats (2 x 1 bed) with associated cycle store to the rear.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the draft decision notice.

Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) informed members that the application was deferred for consultation which had since been carried out. She then referred to an additional objection received from 108 Norton Road which set out concerns relating to loss of view, privacy, inadequate parking facilities, concerns on security and need for adequate refuse collection facilities.

Mr Udesch reiterated his objections to the proposal on grounds of loss of garage, loss of residential amenities, inadequate parking facilities and construction noise.

He also raised civil matters which the Committee considered were not within its jurisdiction. Mr Ajay (an objector) reiterated the concerns raised by the previous speaker.

In response to some of the concerns raised, Rachel Murrell stated that it would be reasonable to impose additional conditions which sought to ensure the rear access route was maintained for servicing and the contractors were members of the Considerate Contractors Scheme (CCS).

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to additional conditions requiring rear access route to be maintained for servicing, upgrade and demarcation of parking to frontage and membership of Considerate Contractor Scheme.

4. Olympic Office Centre Car Park (Plot C) Rutherford Way Wembley (Ref. 14/4981)

PROPOSAL: Reserved matters application for the construction of a 15 storey building of a mixed use development providing 211 residential units (20% affordable) and two Use Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5 units at ground floor level, and associated landscaping, parking, servicing, public realm works and accesses to the highway. The application has been submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (details of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping), 9 (car parking) and 12 (wind environment assessment) of outline planning permission reference 13/1522

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the draft decision notice.

Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) clarified that the separation distance measurement between the front elevation of the ground floor retail units and the fence along Olympic Way would be 9.8m and that the main core of the proposed building would be sited an additional 15m away. She continued that the density of the scheme was between 530-1454 habitable rooms per hectare (London Plan 650-1100) for central sites with PTAL 5 however, its scale and design were considered acceptable as the proposal would provide good quality residential accommodation whilst making efficient use of land.

Raul Veevers (applicant's agent) was present to answer members' questions. In response to questions, the agent clarified that the servicing arrangements would be managed privately and that the scheme would incorporate a private garden between the pedway and the site. He continued that there would be 51 car parking spaces which would be allocated to those who would buy their properties and that due to the public transport network in the area the PTAL rating was considered to be high. The applicant's agent confirmed that there would be 2 separate entrances; one of which would serve the market properties and the other would be for the affordable units. This was justified on the basis the private entrance would be served by a concierge and would have higher service charges which were not acceptable to the housing association / registered provider.

In bringing the discussion to an end, the Chair expressed the Committee's disappointment at the provision of 2 separate entrances for market and those in affordable units. She also expressed concern about the level of affordable housing being provided though noted that this had already been agreed through the outline planning permission. Members also requested officers to pursue the potential for further bus routes in Wembley with TfL.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.

5. Playground, Silver Jubilee Park Townsend Lane (Ref. 14/4971)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing single storey building and erection of a new single storey building with mono pitched roofs to provide changing room facilities and relocation of the pedestrian access path.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the draft decision notice.

With reference to the supplementary report, Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) clarified the matters raised at the site visit. Members heard that the building would be maintained by Veolia. She continued that the advice from Sports and Parks was that the pitches were currently being used by Springfield Youth FC and Neasden Gaelic FC but it was understood that other clubs would like to hire the pitches but not without a pavilion. The Area Planning Manager then drew members' attention to the sources of funding for the project as set out in the supplementary report.

Sanjya Abeywickrema (objector) raised concerns about the existing changing room building which he stated was hardly in use and as such was attracting activities such as youth drug taking, graffiti and anti-social behaviour. He added that the proposed building would be detrimental to the local community through noise nuisance, parking concerns and increased anti-social behaviour including fly tipping. The objector also raised concerns about inadequate consultation with the residents on the proposal and concern that the location was described as 'Playground'. He suggested that if members were minded to grant approval then consideration should be given to relocating the proposed building to around 100m away towards the allotment area.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Farah (Welsh Harp ward member) stated that he had been approached by residents. He stated that although local residents were not against the principle of the re-development, they had concerns about its maintenance and the consultation.

In response to the concerns raised, the Area Planning Manager stated that the scheme had been reviewed by Sports and Parks and that the parking, having been assessed against standards, was considered acceptable. She added that wider consultation was carried out including display of a site notice. Members

were of the view that the residents should be consulted on landscape proposals and any security measures to be developed.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to additional conditions requiring landscape proposals to be developed in consultation with local residents and details of security measures.

6. Salusbury Primary School (Ref. 14/3427)

PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for use of the school's playground area to run a weekly (every Saturday) community car boot sale.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the draft decision notice and additional condition detailed in the Supplementary Report regarding compliance with Management Plan.

With reference to the supplementary report, Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) responded to the queries raised at the site visit. He advised members that as the car boot sale had not taken place since summer 2014, 'retrospective' be removed from the description. He clarified that given the distance between the application site and St Augustine's School in Kilburn where a car boot sale was also operated, the cumulative impact would not directly affect the application. In respect of concerns about site management, the Area Planning Manager confirmed that the Site Management Plan required vendors to book a time slot for staggered arrival of vehicles with traffic marshalls also on hand to ensure that the proposal did not result in unacceptable impact in terms of congestion. With that in mind, he recommended approval subject to conditions and an additional condition as set out in the supplementary report.

Helen Durnsford, on behalf of Queens Park Residents' Association (QPRA) objected to the proposed car boot sale on grounds of traffic and parking problems that would ensue. She added that as the controlled parking zones (CPZ) restrictions were in place during weekdays only, the operation of the car boot sale every Sunday when there were no restrictions on parking would have an unacceptable traffic and parking impact on local residents.

Stephan Beastall in support of the application stated that due to public transport accessibility, the proposed car boot sale would not have significant traffic impact on residents. He added that the car boot sale would generate additional income for the school, referring to a signed petition by the residents in support of the car boot sale.

In response to members questions, Mr Beastall stated that he chose Salusbury Primary School site for the car boot sale due to its accessibility to the public transport network. He continued that visitor parking within the site was about 200 to 600 and as most visitors would be local residents, traffic congestion would be minimal.

During members' discussion they considered transport and traffic impact as the key issue particularly as the area did not have parking restrictions during the weekend. A suggestion for a monthly car boot sale was made but was not concurred. Members agreed to refuse planning permission for the car boot due to its transportation impacts on the area.

DECISION: Refused planning permission due to the transportation impacts on the local area as a result of vehicles associated with the car boot sale and visitors.

7. Land adjacent to Kings Road, NW10 3BL (Ref. 14/2803)

PROPOSAL: Erection of a detached two storey 3 bed dwelling house with basement level, car parking and bin stores to the front, cycle store to the rear, new timber fence and landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the draft decision notice.

Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) informed the Committee that significant revisions had been made to the scheme including the omission of a first floor pitched roof element on the northern side, improved boundary relationship with neighbours and a reduction of the first floor projection. The revisions ensured a good separation between the windows and the site boundary and over 20m between facing rear elevation windows. He added that in order to enhance the soft landscaping of the site and the front elevation, a tree had been introduced to the front garden of the proposal. He continued that the application constituted an appropriate form of development in terms of scale, its contemporary design and compliance with Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17 (SPG 17).

Richard Bailey, Shamus O'Connell and Ian Harris (local residents) raised objections to the proposed development on grounds of loss of trees, loss of view, loss of sunlight and loss of privacy. They continued that the proposed development, which they considered to be an over-development of the site, would not only be detrimental to residential amenities but could affect the stability of adjoining fences and also cause subsidence to neighbouring properties. The residents added that they would rather the previous application which proposed a single storey dwelling unit with reduced impact.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Shaw (ward member) stated that she had been approached by the local residents. Councillor Shaw objected on the grounds of loss of light, loss of privacy and loss of view. She continued that the proposal which would involve the loss of a sycamore tree as well as give rise to bright lights to the residents in Peter Avenue would disturb the visual coherence of the character of the area. Councillor Shaw urged members to be minded to refuse the current application and to encourage the applicant to re-submit a scheme for a single storey dwelling unit.

Mira Dimitrova (applicant) stated that the scheme which incorporated an excellent contemporary design and harmonised well with the area, would accord with

guidelines and standards. She added that the site would be landscaped to improve biodiversity.

Patrick Michell (applicant's architect) echoed the views expressed by the applicant and added that the proposal would cause minimal loss of light and minimal impact on residential amenity. In response to members' questions, the architect confirmed that site investigations had been conducted and that the hard standing to the front would have an impermeable layer with concrete crossover. He added that measures including retaining wall and land drain had been taken to ensure that water run off would be reduced. Furthermore, by the use of blinds, curtains and opaque glass, he considered that overlooking would be significantly mitigated. The architect also confirmed that off street parking would not be a neighbourly issue.

Whilst acknowledging the assurances on off-street parking, members felt it expedient to add a further condition to restrict the parking of vehicles on the permeable area outside of the gate

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to an additional condition to restricting the parking of vehicles on the permeable area outside of the gate.

8. Any Other Urgent Business

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2015

The Chair informed members that arising from comments made by an objector to the application for the Welsh School, King Edward VIII Park following publication of the minutes on the website, the minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2015 would be reconsidered at the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 10.15 pm

S MARQUIS
Chair