



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 17 January 2018 at 7.00 pm

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

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Chohan, Jones, Mahmood and McLennan.

Apologies for absence were received from Agha.

1. Declarations of interests

79-83 ODDS, Kenton Road, Harrow, HA3 0AH (Ref. 17/3717)
Garages rear of, Rayners Close, Wembley (Ref. 17/0502)

Councillor Daly declared that as she had in the past expressed objections to both schemes she would reiterate her objections and withdraw from the meeting room during discussions and voting on both applications.

Approaches

All members had received emails from an objector to the application for Drakes Courtyard.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 December 2017 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. 107 Brondesbury Park, Brondesbury, London, NW2 5JL (Ref. 17/2670)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing single storey rear extension, conversion of garage into a habitable room to include replacement of garage door with window and new entrance door, erection of a single storey side to rear extension, roof extension to also include a rear dormer window, insertion of seven rooflights and conversion of dwellinghouse into 6 self-contained flats (1x 3bed and 5x 2bed), provision for cycle parking spaces and bin stores and subdivision of rear garden space

RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Committee resolve to grant planning permission and 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 and any other conditions considered necessary by the Head of Planning

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

That the Committee confirms that it has paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the adjacent Willesden Green Conservation Area as required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Damian Manhertz (Area Planning Team Leader) introduced the report and outlined the key issues of the application. He advised Members that the proposed conversion complied with Council policy regarding the principle of development as the existing house exceeded the minimum floor space threshold. He continued that the proposed extensions would be of an acceptable appearance and would not result in an unduly detrimental impact on the amenities of surrounding occupiers or the character of the locality. In respect of transportation, he advised that the proposal would provide off-street parking and a parking permit restriction would mitigate the potential impact of over-spill parking in the locality of the application site. Additionally and with cycle parking proposed, the development would not have an adverse impact on parking or highway safety.

Mr Briefel (objector) raised concerns that the proposal would be out of scale with the character of neighbouring properties. He added that the proposed development would cause loss of light to the rear garden of his adjoining property.

Mr Glen Christen (applicant's agent) stated that the property with the proposed extensions was adequately large for the conversion into 7 dwelling units. He added that the proposal exceeded the minimum threshold for conversion, the London Plan and space standards. Mr Christen continued that the relatively minor extensions to the property complied with SPG on rear extensions and would have minimal impact on neighbouring amenity.

In response to members' questions on insulation, stacking and potential noise from the nearby temple, Mr Christen advised that further details would be submitted on stacking and that adequate conditions had been recommended in addition to building regulations to address insulation and that noise from the temple would not be an issue to the residents.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.
(Voting for approval was carried as follows: For 5, Against 1 and Abstain 2).

4. 79-83 ODDS, Kenton Road, Harrow, HA3 0AH (Ref. 17/3717)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of a part three part four storey building comprising 39 self-contained flats (27 X 1bed, 8 x 2bed and 4 x 3bed) with associated basement car and cycle parking spaces accessed via new crossover off Rushout Avenue, bin stores, fencing and landscaping

RECOMMENDATION: Resolve to grant planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and referral to the Mayor of London.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated in the Heads of Terms as set out in the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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 be granted 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.

That, if by 3 months of the Committee date the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Victoria McDonagh (Area Planning Team Manager) introduced the scheme and answered members' questions. With reference to the supplementary report, she drew members' attention to the summary of additional comments on the proposal and officers' responses. She then clarified the details submitted by the applicant on the units for disabled use, amended third floor plan and amended conditions 2 and 4.

Mr Alan Dean (objector) stated that although he accepted the principle of the development, he considered that the proposal constituted an overdevelopment of the site, causing overbearing and overlooking to his property. He added that Rushout Avenue, a 4 bus route with queuing traffic and a number of school children was an accident hot spot and therefore there was every need to review the highways assessment with a view to reducing traffic.

Mr Syed Rizvi (objector) speaking in a similar vein echoed the views expressed by the previous speaker, highlighting how dangerous the access to the development would be. He expressed a view that the impact of the junction and the obstruction of views by the fence had not been thoroughly assessed and questioned as to whether a transport statement had been submitted for the application.

In accordance with the planning Code of Practice, Councillor McLennan (speaking as a ward member) declared that she had been approached by residents who lived nearby. Councillor McLennan stated that although she was not averse to the development, she was concerned about the size, overdevelopment and the transport issues in and around Rushout Avenue with four bus routes. She continued that the development could give rise to on-street parking which with the double decker buses would worsen the transport problem in the area. She specified that a CPZ should be implemented in the area if approved. She noted that TfL were in the process of reducing the number of buses on the route and Churchill Avenue was to be made a cycling quietway to discourage vehicles, however, the proposal would not help in reducing traffic and suggested that consideration be given to changing access to Kenton Road so as to reduce the footprint.

In accordance with the planning Code of Practice, Councillor Daly (speaking as a ward member) declared that she had been approached by residents and that she had in the past consistently objected to the proposed development. Councillor Daly stated that whilst she accepted the principle of development on the site, she felt that there were issues regarding stacking and density that needed to be addressed. In addition, the proposal would give rise to transport problems particularly during the rush hour traffic with a backlog of cars trying to access the underground car park. Councillor Daly continued that the Council's highways officers had not produced any evidence about the risks of using Rushout Avenue as the access point to the car park. She questioned whether alternative access arrangements had been considered.

Liz Alexander (applicant's agent) and Nick Wilson (applicant's architect) addressed the committee. Members heard that the proposal for 39 mixed residential units in a sustainable location use was policy compliant, with revisions made to ensure 6m set back as requested by Highways officers. They added that the proposed development would optimise the potential of the site and would deliver 4 shared ownership units, the maximum viable for the development. In response to members' questions, the agent and the architect stated that any attempt to deliver more shared units that stated would affect the viability of the scheme and that the delivery of the scheme could be jeopardised at lower densities.

In the ensuing discussion, members raised concerns about the parking situation, separation distances, density and amenity provisions of the development and questioned the scheme's ability to achieve a 25% family units. Particular concern was also raised about the absence of Highways officers at the meeting to directly

respond to issues of transportation significance including the possibility of a “car free development”.

Officers responded that the scheme was acceptable in density terms, maintaining appropriate relationship and daylighting. They clarified that the scheme did not exceed the maximum parking standards and had been evaluated by Highways officers to be acceptable. They set out that it could not be a “parking permit restricted development as it is not within a Controlled Parking Zone.

A motion was put forward to defer the application to the next meeting to enable highways officers to re-assess the scheme and clarify the transportation concerns raised by Members. This was put to the vote and declared lost. The substantive recommendation was then voted upon and declared carried on the chair’s casting vote.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to amended condition 2 and 4 as set out in the supplementary report.

(Voting for approval was carried on the casting vote of the Chair with the initial votes cast as follows: For 3, Against 3 and Abstain 1).

Note: Councillor Daly having declared an interest withdrew from the meeting room and did not take part in the voting.

5. Garages rear of, Rayners Close, Wembley (Ref. 17/0502)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 17 garages and erection of a three storey building comprising 4 x 2 bed flats and under croft car parking, cycle parking and bin store with associated amenity space and parking provision for existing flats.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Head of Planning be granted 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 be granted 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.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Victoria McDonagh (Area Planning Team Leader) introduced the scheme and answered members’ questions. Members heard that the proposed use was considered appropriate for the area and would result in the provision of new homes within the borough with acceptable design and height and massing in

keeping with the local context. It would also accord with the amenity impact guidance as set out in the Council's Guidance (Supplementary Planning Guidance 17 and draft Supplementary Planning Document 1) and would not result in an unduly detrimental loss of light or outlook to neighbouring properties. In Highways terms, 4 of the garages proposed would be for use by the residents of the proposed development and the remainder (14) would be for use by residents of Fairley Court. She advised that the trees that were proposed to be removed were not considered worthy of retention.

In accordance with the Provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Daly (ward member) stated that she had been approached by local residents. Councillor Daly raised concerns about noise, vibration and loss of parking which she added would result in displacement parking in the neighbouring streets.

Victoria McDonagh clarified that there would be an overall increase in parking spaces with additional 6 spaces for residents of Fairley Court. The allocation of spaces for residents of existing and proposed flats could be conditioned as part of car parking management plan. In response to members' questions she clarified the amenity provisions and in respect of vibration, she recommended an amendment to condition 4 to include vibration assessment by Environmental Health officers.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended and subject to additional details on vibration assessment.

(Voting for approval was carried as follows: For 6, Against 0 and Abstain 1)

Note: Councillor Daly having declared an interest withdrew from the meeting room and did not take part in the voting.

6. Land adjacent to Hindhurst Court and Hartgrove Court, Hay Lane , London NW9 0NJ (Ref. 17/4151)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing garages and erection of a three storey building to provide three self-contained flats (1x 1bed and 2x 2bed) with associated alterations including provision for car parking spaces, bicycle stores, bin stores, amenity space and soft and hard landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Head of Planning be granted 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 be granted 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.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Victoria McDonagh (Area Planning Team Leader) introduced the report and answered members' questions. With reference to the supplementary report, she advised members that the applicant had submitted revised plans showing; a) the replacement of the proposed London Plane tree with Hornbeam tree; b) the means of pedestrian access to prevent residents from having to walk across the car park to access the flats.

These amended conditions 2 and 8 and removed condition 9. She then clarified some inaccuracies within the main report and added that additional conditions for the submission of a Construction Management Statement and details of boilers

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended and subject to amended conditions 2 and 8, removal of condition 9, requirement for the submission of a Construction Management Statement, details of boilers and clarifications as set out in the supplementary report.

(Voting for approval was unanimous as follows: For 8, Against 0 and Abstain 0)

7. Oakington Manor Primary School, Oakington Manor Drive, Wembley, HA9 6NF (Ref. 17/3940)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of parts of the existing school buildings and erection of new part single storey, first and second floor extensions to school to be taken place across a phased five year construction programme.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.

(Voting for approval was unanimous as follows: For 8, Against 0 and Abstain 0)

8. Watling Gate, Edgware Road, Kingsbury, London, NW9 6NB v(Ref. 17/4508)

PROPOSAL: Erection of a split level upper storey extension above the existing building to provide additional B1a Use Class units with external alterations to the existing building to include ground-floor extension to existing D1 unit, replacement windows, doors, canopies and roller shutters, the re-cladding of the building facade and the installation of boundary railings. (Amended description 07.12.17).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.

(Voting for approval was unanimous as follows: For 8, Against 0 and Abstain 0)

9. 1 & 2 Drakes Courtyard, Kilburn High Road, London, NW6 7JR (Ref. 17/2884)

PROPOSAL: Alterations to the fenestration and doors at 1-2 Drakes Courtyard

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

David Glover (Acting Development Management Manager) advised the Committee that a further objection had been received from an objector and recommended that the application be deferred to the next Planning Committee meeting so that a written summary, evaluation and response could be provided.

DECISION: Deferred to the next meeting to enable officers to assess new issues raised by an objector.

10. WILLESDEN GREEN BAPTIST CHURCH, High Road, London, NW10 2PR (Ref. 17/3673)

PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing adjoining structures to the rear; erection of a part two and part three storey rear extension including basement level; internal alterations to create new mezzanine and upper floor levels to facilitate the creation of 7 residential units (1 x 1bed, 4 x 2bed & 2 x 3bed); 7No. dormer windows to the east and west roof slopes; new access gates to facilitate vehicle and pedestrian access from Huddlestone Road; alterations to fenestration including new front access door to residential units; removal of part of front boundary wall; and provision of secure storage for 14 cycles for the residential units and refuse facilities to serve both residential and church buildings.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions (and informatives) to secure the matters set out within the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

Damian Manhertz (Area Planning Team Leader) introduced the scheme and answered members' questions.

Matthew Bright raised concerns about the application in respect of increased noise, congestion and anti-social behaviour (ASB) particularly from the youth club within the street outside the church. In response to members' questions, Mr Bright stated that although the situation had improved further to Police intervention and that it had not occurred recently, he was fearful of the prospect from increased activities in the Church with associated increase in numbers of people in the street and thus encouraging more ASB. In response to members' questions Mr Bright stated that his concern was not against the principle of the development but rather the ASB which may return with the increased use of the Church hall for youth activities on Fridays.

Patrick Hannon (objector) speaking in a similar vein added that the proposed development which would involve excavation, would be cause vibration to the detriment of the residents of Huddlestone Road, potentially causing damage to their homes. He also raised concerns about highways issues.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Jones (ward member) stated that she had been approached by residents. Councillor Jones stated that the construction of the basement would cause destruction and that the proposal would cause overlooking to the neighbouring properties in particular Faith Court. She suggested that the “Pay and Display” should be changed to “Residents Parking Only” in order to minimise parking impact of the development and that officials of the church and the residents should liaise to iron out any differences they may have about the proposal.

Reverend Paul Akinola and Steve Ibbotson (applicant’s architect) addressed the Committee. Reverend Akinola explained that the proposed expansion of the Church was to upgrade it to comply with modern requirements and to meet the increasing demands for a growing congregation. He added that the proposed dwelling units would be sympathetic to the character of the area. The architect added that the proposed use of the basement would be integral to the church’s activities, providing in addition, shower facilities and a storage area for clothes donated to the church. He continued that the church had agreed with the residents of Faith Court to install gates to the rear of the Church. He explained that the anti-social behaviour was associated with a group who were no longer using the premises, and that those issues had not occurred since 2010.

During discussion, a member suggested the addition of a construction management plan, further details of the gates to the rear (either set further back from the footway or management procedures in place for times when they are faulty) and an informative to ensure that damage to public realm was repaired.

In summing up, Damian Manhertz the principle of the development had been established and that informatives had been added to best manage any potential problems that may result.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended subject to considerate construction, construction management plan and further details for gates to the rear of the church

(Voting for approval was unanimous as follows: For 8, Against 0 and Abstain 0)

11. Joy House, 69-85 Rucklidge Avenue, London, NW10 4QA (Ref. 16/5066)

PROPOSAL: Continued use of the building as a 49-bedroom (116-bed) hostel for the homeless (Sui Generis), for a temporary period of 3 years.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions (and informatives) to secure the matters set out within the report.

That the Head of Planning be granted 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.

Damian Manhertz (Area Planning Team Leader) introduced the report. He drew members' attention to the supplementary report that set out officers' responses to issues raised by the Residents' Association and a ward member. He however recommended additional conditions to take account of the comments made by the Residents' Association as set out in the decision column below.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended and subject to a revised condition relating to the gated entry on Rucklidge Avenue being restricted for Disabled residents of the Hostel and for emergency use only, with details of management arrangements to be approved by the Council and implemented within 4 months of the date of the decision relating to the use of the gate.
(Voting on the recommendation for approval was unanimous as follows; For 8, Against 0, Abstain 0).

12. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm

R MOHER
(Vice Chair in theChair)