



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 15 March 2017 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Marquis (Chair), Agha (Vice-Chair), Colacicco, Daly, Hylton, J Mitchell Murray, Pitruzzella and Maurice

ALSO PRESENT:

Apologies for absence were received from Long and Moher

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

Raglan Court, Empire Way, Wembley (Ref. 16/3408)

Land at Junction of Engineers Way and First Way, Wembley (Ref. 17/0016)

Councillor Marquis declared sensitive interest in both applications and indicated that she would therefore withdraw from the meeting room and not take part in the discussion or voting on both applications.

633-635 Harrow Road, Wembley (Ref. 16/4666)

Councillor Daly declared that as she had in the past stated her opposition to the application, she would withdraw from the meeting room and not take part in the discussion or voting on the application.

2. Minutes of the last meeting - 15 February 2017

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the last meeting held on 15 February 2017 be approved as an accurate record subject to the following amendments to item 9;

On page 6 add "of leaseholders" before social rent in the last paragraph.

On page 7 delete "marginal" in the last paragraph.

3. 370 High Road & 54-68 Dudden Hill Lane, London, NW10 (Ref. 16/0445/PRE)

Peter Mahoney and Nick Francis gave a presentation on the development and responded to questions. Members then questioned the presenters and raised issues for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application.

The main issues raised at the meeting were:

- Breakdown of affordable housing to Brent residents.
- Affordable workshop
- Community space
- Parking, servicing and refuse collection arrangements.
- Community involvement and engagement.

- Materials
- Land contamination

4. 500 High Road, Wembley HA9 7BH (Ref. 16/1537/PRE)

Ian McGregor and Stephen Donnelly gave a presentation on the development and responded to questions. Members then questioned the presenters and raised issues for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application.

The main issues raised at the meeting were:

- Room standards and amenity space.
- Quality of entrances.
- Issue of pepper potting.
- Selection of Registered Social Landlord (RSL).
- Height of the proposal.
- Daylight and sunlight issues.
- Impact on residential properties in Elm Road, Wembley.
- Community engagement to involve local stakeholders and evidence to show that their views had been taken into account in the final scheme.

5. Raglan Court, Empire Way, Wembley (Ref. 16/3408)

PROPOSAL: Erection of roof extension comprising 2 additional floors over Block A and Block B to provide a total of 72 additional self-contained flats (36 x 1bed on each Block) with associated landscaping, ancillary servicing and plant, cycle parking and associated works.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order, any direction by the Secretary of State pursuant to the Consultation Direction, prior completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report, delegated authority to the Head of Planning to impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the report and to refuse planning permission if by 3 months of the committee date (14th June 2017) the legal agreement has not been completed.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the scheme and answered members questions. In reference to the supplementary report, he responded to additional queries raised by a resident of Raglan Court in respect of scale, design, layout, affordable housing mix, transport assessment and parking.

Paul Treacy (applicant's architect) addressed the Committee and answered members' questions on affordable units, decanting and disable persons units. He clarified that the viability analysis submitted with the application confirmed that 15% was appropriate and that as the deck would be robust and resilient to maintain noise acoustics, there would be no decanting. He added that disabled persons units had not been considered as the existing blocks had no lifts.

In the discussion that followed, members considered it appropriate for the developer to publicise their contact details on a banner as part of the Considerate Contactor Scheme

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.
(Voting was as follows: For 6 ; Against 1).

6. 633 & 635 Harrow Road, Wembley (Ref. 16/4666)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of Nos 633 and 635 Harrow Road and detached double garage and erection of a new three storey block providing 8 self-contained flats (1 x 1bed, 5 x 2bed and 2 x 3bed) whilst retaining existing vehicular crossovers from Harrow Road and Dalmeny Close, provision for car, cycle and bike parking, bin stores and landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the report and to grant delegated authority to the Head of Planning to make minor changes to the wording of the decision, where necessary.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the proposal and answered members' questions.

Maria Henning (objector) objected on grounds of overlooking, lack of privacy, inadequate parking provisions, out of character with the houses in the area and failure to comply with Supplementary Planning Guidance 17 (SPG17).

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Daly stated that she had been approached by the applicants and the objectors. Echoing the views expressed by the objector, Councillor Daly added that the proposed development would adversely impact on the suburban character of the area. She also referenced the close proximity of the proposal to the boundary with No. 631 Harrow Road which she added could give rise to loss of privacy.

As she had previously expressed views against the application Councillor Daly left the meeting room after addressing the Committee.

Phillip Norvill (applicant's agent) addressed the Committee and answered members' questions. He added that although the proposal would alter the streetscene, it would respond to the needs of the area including housing. He continued that the proposal complied with adopted policies and development plan policies in addition to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contribution.

In the ensuing discussion, members noted that the proposal was a departure from SPG17 and expressed concerns regarding stacking, inadequate provision for car and cycle parking, impact on neighbours and overdevelopment of the site. With that in view, members were minded to refuse the application and thus deferred the application to the next meeting for a report setting out conditions for refusal

DECISION: Deferred to the next meeting for a report setting out conditions for refusal.

Voting was recorded as follows:

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| FOR | Councillor Agha | (1) |
| AGAINST: | Councillor Joshua Mitchell-Murray | (1) |
| ABSTENTION: | Councillors Marquis, Hylton, Colacicco, Maurice and Pitruzzella | (5) |

7. Garages, Atherton Heights, Wembley (Ref.16/5103)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing 15 garages and erection of 18 pre-fabricated garages (for parking/storage purposes) and retention of 2 existing garages (for parking/storage purposes)

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and grant delegated authority to the Head of Planning to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out in the report.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the scheme and answered members' questions. He referenced the supplementary report which set out additional objections received together with officers' responses.

Reena Patel in objecting to the proposed development raised concerns about the lack of alternative arrangements for residents' parking, increased congestion and noise due to construction vehicles and obstruction to access for refuse trucks. She added that the proposal would therefore result in the detriment to residential amenity as well as could affect the foundations of nearby properties.

James Dunsford (applicant's agent) addressed the Committee and answered members' questions. He responded that refuse trucks were not using Atherton Heights as alleged by the objector and that the proposal was to rebuild the dilapidated garages. He clarified that as only three car parking spaces would be blocked during construction, any potential disruption would be minimal.

David Glover clarified that as the land was privately owned, residents had no legal right to parking and thus no parking displacement would ensue. He added there would be no material impact as a result of the proposal. John Fletcher (Highways) added that a Construction Method Statement was recommended to be secured through condition to minimise potential disruption.

In the discussion that followed, Councillor Maurice suggested additional conditions for the garages to be used for the storage of vehicles only and also not to be used in connection with business. Serinther Atkar (legal representative) advised against both suggested conditions on the grounds that they would be unreasonable. In agreeing the recommendation, members added an informative that Highways

officers be requested to conduct a review to ensure that the proposal did not result in any detriment to existing residents.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended and an informative requesting Highways officers to conduct a review to ensure that the proposal did not result in any detriment on existing residents.

(Voting: For 5, Against 1, Abstentions 2).

8. Land at junction of Engineers Way and First Way, Wembley (Quintain plot E03) Ref.17/0016)

PROPOSAL: Reserved matters application relating to condition 1 (layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping) pursuant to outline planning permission 15/5550. This application relates to Plot E03 (known as Canada Court) for the construction of a building ranging from 12 to 26 storeys in height, providing 743 residential units within private and intermediate rented tenures (intermediate rented tenure to be London Housing Bank dwellings), with private communal residential landscaped gardens and clubhouse; energy centre (to serve the wider masterplan and the SW Lands development); a podium level bridge link (connecting to Plot E05 mezzanine), 91 coach parking spaces, and 569 sqm (GEA) of commercial space for either B1 (Business) and/or D1 (Community) use, ancillary space, and associated plant, cycle storage, refuse provision and associated infrastructure.

The application seeks to discharge the following conditions for Plot E03:

19(h): Wind; 19 (k): Internal layout of buildings; 19(l): Access; 19(m): Daylight; 19(n): Private external space; 27: Construction Logistics Plan; 31: Counter Terrorism Measures; 34: Noise; 36: Noise; 37: Construction Method Statement; 38: Air Quality; 39: CHP Emissions; 46: Piling Method Statement; 49: Indicative Phasing.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Reserved Matters (condition 1) and details pursuant to conditions 19(h), 19(k), 19(l), 19(m), 19 (n), 27, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 49 be approved.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the proposal and answered members' questions. In referencing the supplementary report, he informed members that as no response had been received from Thames Water to confirm the discharge of condition 46 (piling), the applicant had withdrawn this condition and would seek to discharge this condition separately and accordingly, the description of the proposal had been updated.

Julian Tollast and Brett Herbert (applicant's agents) addressed the Committee and answered members' questions on heating system, reduction on carbon emission, affordable housing rent after seven years and coach parking facilities. They added that the key planning reasons for recommending approval had been amplified in the officers' report.

DECISION: Approved reserved matters as recommended and an informative requesting the applicant to display their telephone number on a banner.

(Voting For 6, Against 1, Abstention 0)

9. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 11.11 pm

S MARQUIS
Chair