



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 12 July 2017 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Agha (Chair), Councillor Moher (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Ahmed (substitute for Councillor Daly), S Choudhary, Colacicco, Hylton, Maurice and W Mitchell Murray

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Daly

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

None.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting - 28 June 2017**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 June 2017 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting subject to Councillor Ahmed being shown as in attendance.

3. **14 Grendon Gardens, Wembley HA9 9NE**

PROPOSAL: Proposed part single and part two storey rear extension, loft conversion including addition of dormer window to rear slope and insertion of roof lights, remodelling of front entrance and landscaping scheme of front garden to existing dwelling house.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee resolve to REFUSE planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed rear extension, by reason of its size and siting and in particular, the inclusion of a first floor rear element of extension, having regard to the hilly character and dramatic changes in level throughout the Conservation Area, represents the provision of a feature that is detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding conservation area, resulting in harm to the wider views of the property and in particular, views of the first floor rear elevation and the roof slopes within the Barn Hill Conservation Area. This is contrary to policy DMP1 and DMP7 of the Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies 2016 and the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to vary the reason for refusal) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could

reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

The application was called in to Committee by Councillors Carr, Warren, Shaw, Kansagra, Colwill and Davidson for reasons set out in the report under members call-in procedure.

David Glover (Deputy Area Planning Manager) introduced the report and answered members' questions. He informed members that the Design Guide for the Barnhill Conservation Area set out a presumption against the provision of first floor rear extensions and that there was no justification for a departure from the adopted guidance. Accordingly, the first floor rear element of the extension was considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. He added that the soft landscaping of the proposal fell below the minimum level set out within the Design Guide and the level set out within condition 4 of the 2016 consent relating to this property. He then referenced the supplementary report that set out additional representation from Barnhill Residents Association which supported the views of Council officers that the proposal was contrary to the design guide and harmful to the character and appearance of the house and Conservation Area.

Brian Retkin (applicant) stated that the proposal was in accordance with Barnhill Conservation Design Guide as it would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area or would not adversely impact on adjoining neighbours. He continued that relevant precedents for a 2-storey rear extension existed in the area, referring to developments at 7 Brampton Grove and 21 Eversley Avenue. In response to members' questions, the applicant stated that the rear extension was required to allow stairs to be erected into the loft area and would match the design without any changes to the roof form and thus making the proposal less intrusive.

David Glover submitted that whilst the single storey element of the extension and the porch were considered to be acceptable, the proposed first floor rear element of the extension was considered harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and contrary to policies DMP1, DMP7 and the Conservation Area Design Guide. He added that the frontage layout was also contrary to the design guide, however, a revised layout and associated details could be secured through condition if consent was to be granted.

DECISION: Planning permission refused as recommended.
(Voting on the recommendation for approval was as follows: For 7; Against 1)

4. 58 Neasden Lane, London NW10 2UJ

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing three storey light industrial building and erection of a 5 storey hotel comprising 196 rooms with ancillary cafe/bar, restaurant, gymnasium/meeting room, roof top plant compound and associated car, coach and cycle parking spaces, landscaping and boundary treatment.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions [and informatives] to secure the matters set out in the report

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

Angus Saunders (Area Planning Manager) introduced the report and answered members' questions. He informed members that planning permission had already been granted for the redevelopment of the site to provide a new hotel, albeit for a 60 bedroom hotel. As such, the principle of the proposed development was acceptable. In addition to this the proposal was not considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality nor the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Officers also considered that the proposal would have significant planning merits hence, the recommendation for approval.

Will Thompson (applicant's agent) stated that following an extensive pre-application discussion with officers, the proposal would result in a development that was compliant with the London Plan and Core Strategy policies. He added that the proposed 5-storey building would be set back from the street resulting in a more open frontage and allowing for coach parking, servicing and landscaping within the site boundaries. Members heard that as the site was adjoined on either side by industrial buildings, the proposal was unlikely to have any significant impact on neighbours. In addition to access to good transport network, a Delivery and Service Management Plan had been submitted.

Angus Saunders advised members that in recommending the application for approval, great weight had been placed on the extant planning permission, the more efficient use of the land by the 196 bedroom hotel and a positive contribution to the townscape. He drew members' attention to conditions 9 and 13 which sought to address concerns on land contamination and air quality neutral, in addition to informatives on asbestos.

In endorsing officers' recommendation for approval, members added additional informatives requiring the applicant to ensure that any damage to public realm is repaired and that maximum standards were applied to fire and safety issues.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended with additional informatives requiring the applicant to ensure that any damage to public realm is repaired and that maximum standards were applied to fire and safety issues. (Voting on the application was unanimous).

5. 17/1080/PRE Access Storage, First Way, Wembley, HA9 0JD

Roy Collado from Collado Collins (architect) and Jim Pool from DP9 (planning agent) 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:

- Affordable housing/living should comply with policies.
- Circulation of space especially on match or event days.
- No pepper potting
- Adherence to maximum standards of fire and safety issues.
- Adequate facilities for infrastructure including facilities for children.
- Scale and height of the proposal.

6. 17/1097/PRE Cannon Trading Estate, First Way, Wembley, HA9 0JD

Peter Leiper and Owain Nedin 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:

- An assessment of the likely demand for student accommodation associated with this educational institution should therefore be submitted with the application to support the proposals to demonstrate that the amount of student accommodation that is proposed is set at a level that will not go beyond the projected demand for this education institution.
- To demonstrate that the proposed standard of accommodation is sufficient to meets the requirements of the particular group (in this case, students).
- The amount of student housing cap and the ability to deliver 1,500 homes across the wider SSA.
- The application submission should depict the emerging context on the plans to confirm that the building would be appropriately suited to its surroundings
- An assessment of the impact on the protected views from these location will need to be produced and provided to the Council for consideration and should accompany the application.
- Planting should also be incorporated along the southern side of the building, along the access road. Given the high proportion of the site proposed to be covered by buildings, green roofs should also be incorporated.
- An Accessibility Management Plan to meet the requirement for 10% of the student rooms to be wheelchair accessible.
- A separation of at least 10m is established from the built form of the development
- The need for improved pedestrian crossing facilities on First Way should be considered.
- Wider community engagement.

7. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

COUNCILLOR A AGHA
Chair