



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held as an online virtual meeting on Wednesday 9 September 2020 at 6.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Johnson (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), S Butt, Chappell, Hylton, Mahmood, Maurice and Sangani.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Suresh Kansagra.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Denselow.

### 1. Election of Vice Chair

Councillor Johnson (Vice Chair in the Chair) invited nominations for Vice Chair for the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Maurice be elected as the Vice Chair for this meeting.

### 2. Declarations of interests

Councillor S. Butt declared that he had known the objector to the application for 65 Teignmouth Road but he would consider the application with an open mind.

Approaches.

All members declared that they had received emails from the objectors in connection with the application for Claremont School.

### 3. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2020 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

### 4. 20/0587 1, 2, 3 & 9 Watkin Road, Wembley, HA9 0NL

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 1x part-20, part-17 storey building and 1x 14 storey building together containing 174 residential units; commercial floor space (B1a and B1c use class) on ground, first and second floors; car and cycle parking, refuse storage, amenity space and associated landscaping.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

To grant planning permission subject to referral to the Mayor of London (stage 2 referral) and the prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above and to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

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 the "expiry date" of this application (subject to any amendments/extensions to the expiry date agreed by both parties) the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is 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.

Mr Toby Huntingford (Principal Planning Officer) introduced the report, setting out the key issues and answered Members' questions. He referenced the supplementary report and clarified the statutory consultation period, additional representations, officers' responses to them and drew members' attention to an additional condition on the use of a diesel generator for the development to ensure an acceptable air quality impact. Mr Huntingford explained that the statutory consultation period had been met and ended on 1<sup>st</sup> September but that due to a technical error, the site notice had specified that comments may be made until 10<sup>th</sup> September. Officers considered that it would be appropriate for the Committee to proceed with the consideration of the application and that the decision be made on the basis that should any representations be received on 10 September which in the view of the Head of Planning and Development had not been addressed in the committee report or at the meeting and which would fundamentally affect the resolution reached by the committee and could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee, the application would be re-presented to a later planning committee meeting for further consideration.

Members sought legal advice on proceeding with the application on the basis outlined by the Principal Planning Officer. Ms Saira Tambo (Legal adviser to the Committee) advised that in her view, the Council had complied with all legal

statutory requirements on consultation and that it was perfect for the Committee to proceed with consideration of the application as amplified by the officer.

Mr Quentin Parry (in remote attendance) objected to the application raising concerns about the calculation of the site plot and the consultation process alleging that majority of the consultation letters were either sent to student accommodation with transient population or to unoccupied new developments. Mr Parry requested deferral of the application until the Council received all comments.

Mr David Freedman (in remote attendance) objected on grounds of inadequate consultation, daylight and sunlight report.

Mr Dominic Tombs (agent, in remote attendance) submitted the following points for the Committee to note;

- The scheme would help Brent to deliver on the aspirations of the wider Site Allocation and provide 174 much-needed tenure blind homes including 35% affordable housing with 50% of the affordable homes being family sized;
- All the new homes meet or exceed modern space standards with high proportion of dual aspect homes with every home having access to both private and communal amenity spaces;
- The scheme would be car-free, provide secure cycle storage for all homes and 10% of homes would be wheelchair compliant.
- The scheme would deliver net uplift in employment floorspace and the introduction of new affordable workspace
- The scheme would deliver public realm improvements through the provision of a landscaped pedestrian route towards the station and also allow for the future access to Wealdstone Brook as a recreation space in line with the Council's long-term aspirations for the area.

Prior to Members' discussion, Councillor Maurice moved that the application be deferred until after the consultation period had ended. Officers advised against that due to the considerable amount of consultation already carried out and in view of the legal advice received at the meeting.

In the ensuing discussion, Members raised queries in respect of the amount of affordable housing, daylight and sunlight impact and flood risk. Officers responded that the scheme was policy compliant and that the amount of affordable housing was determined by a robust independent viability assessment. The daylight and sunlight analysis carried out by the applicant was in line with BRE guidance and that the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the limited impact which was considered commensurate and acceptable. Members heard that Environment Agency had considered acceptable the adequate flood risk mitigation measures including raised ground floor, drainage and attenuation.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by a majority

decision to approve the application subject to the amendment and the additional condition set out within the supplementary report

**DECISION:**

Granted consent, as recommended, subject to the Section 106 Heads of Terms, an additional condition relating to the use of diesel generators and referral to the Mayor of London for his Stage 2 decision and on the basis that the application be presented to a later Planning Committee meeting for further consideration should further representations received on 10 September which, in the view of the Head of Planning and Development, have not been addressed in the Committee report or at the Committee meeting and which would fundamentally affect the resolution reached by the Committee and could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

(Voting on the amended recommendation was: For 5, Against 1).

**5. 20/1151 All Units at Dowlings Parade, HNS Autos and Delta Hand Car Wash, Bridgewater Road, Wembley, HA0 1AJ**

**PROPOSAL:**

Partial demolition of the existing buildings and structures, the erection of a co-location' scheme ranging in height from 2 to 7 storeys, incorporating industrial floorspace with residential units, together with associated landscaping, vehicular access arrangements, car and cycle parking, servicing and refuse and recycling facilities.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

To GRANT planning permission subject to completion of a legal agreement to secure the planning obligations set out within the Committee report.

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

That the Head of Planning is 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 the "expiry date" of this application (subject to any amendments/extensions to the expiry date agreed by both parties) the legal agreement has not been completed, the Head of Planning is 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.

Mr Denis Toomey (Planning Officer) introduced the report setting out the key issues and answered Members' questions. He referenced the supplementary report that set out an additional condition.

Mr Alan Gunn-Jones (agent in remote attendance) addressed the Committee and answered Members' questions. He drew Members' attention to the following aspects of the proposal:

- The design process, informed by pre-application consultation, responded to the issues of concern raised by an earlier application for the site by Officers and other statutory consultees and acknowledged the changing policy context at both the local and strategic levels
- The proposal would work together with the approved development proposed for the adjoining site, enhancing and complementing each other and serve as a catalyst for achieving design excellence in the Growth Area and its regeneration.
- The high quality design of the policy compliant proposal would comprise of durable materials with minimal maintenance required over the lifetime of the building.
- Each flat would have a dual aspect encouraging natural cross ventilation and direct daylight, along with individual private amenity outdoor space as well as a mixture of individual and communal outdoor space ranging from play areas (young children), to exercising space for adults and seating and planting for all to enjoy.

During the ensuing discussion, officers addressed Members' queries on daylight and sunlight aspects of the application adding that the slight infringement was acceptable, on balance. Members were advised that the impact of this development alone would not warrant the need for infrastructure, drawing attention to GP facilities in the nearby Northfields development and the approved proposal for a school in Neasden Lane. In terms of landscaping, there would be a net gain of 8 new trees to replace the existing low value trees.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application subject to the amendment and the additional condition set out within the supplementary report.

#### DECISION:

Granted planning permission, subject to conditions as set out in draft decision notice, updated condition 2 as set out within the supplementary report and the completion of the legal agreement.

**6. 19/1388 Claremont High School, Claremont Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0UH**

**PROPOSAL:**

Construction of an additional floodlit artificial grass sports pitch and cricket practice facility with incorporated batting cages, installation of 12 floodlights, erection of high boundary fences with associated gates, formation of pedestrian access stairs and ramp.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out within the Committee reports.

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

That the Head of Planning is granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committees 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.

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to any direction by the Secretary of State pursuant to the Consultation Direction.

Ms Nicola Blake (Planning Officer) introduced the report setting out the key issues and answered Members' questions. She referenced the supplementary report that set out additional objections and officers' responses to them.

Mrs Sue Wood speaking on behalf of Wealdstone Brook Residents objected to the proposal for several reasons including the following, referencing a video film she had had circulated to all members prior to the meeting:

- 18 floodlights would result in glare and thus severe impact on residential amenities and wildlife.
- The proposal would exacerbate traffic and parking problems in the area.
- Lack of noise and traffic assessment to support the application.

Mrs Nicola Boughey Executive (Executive Head Teacher) and Mr Gary Benn (architect) in remote attendance addressed the Committee and answered Members' questions. She raised several points in support of the application including the following:

- The proposal, an extension to the current AstroTurf that was successfully created in 2009, would assist in meeting students' demands for its use.
- As the school field would be out of use from October to April (water logged / London clay), an AstroTurf would give the school and the students another all year round outdoor space.
- The AstroTurf would not solely be a commercial venture as alleged by some objectors. All lettings would be between 6pm – 9pm and weekends until 5pm with parking facilities accommodated on the school playground and managed by the school's site team
- The plans for the Astro have addressed issues relating drainage/plans from Environmental Agency. ecology survey, bat survey, illumination and light spillage.

In accordance with the planning Code of Practice, Councillor Kansagra (ward member) stated that he had been approached by Chair of Wealdstone Brook Residents Association. Councillor Kansagra raised concerns with the application including the following:

- Over-development of the school site
- The use of microphones and the level of lighting for the Astro turf would increase noise levels and light spillage to the detriment of residential amenities.

In responding to the issues raised, officers stated that Environmental Health had not expressed concerns on the noise levels and lighting, in particular as the lighting would be angled to minimise any potential spillage. Members noted that as the application was minimal in terms of traffic, it did not warrant traffic assessment.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application subject to the amendment and the additional condition set out within the supplementary report.

**DECISION:**

Granted planning permission as recommended and as set out in the draft decision notice.

(Voting on the amended recommendation was: For 5, Against 1).

**7. 19/4130 Land rear of 65, Teignmouth Road, London**

**PROPOSAL:**

Conversion of garage into a residential unit (Use Class C3) and works to include a single storey extension, 2 rooflights, provision of cycle and refuse storage, associated landscaping and alterations to boundary

**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 Committee 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.

Ms Michele Katzler (Planning Officer) introduced the report, setting out the key issues and answered members' questions. She clarified that the application which was for refurbishment work would not involve any demolition.

Mr Ishrat Malik (in remote attendance) objected to the application for several reasons including the following:

- The application which would involve a change of use from garages to a living accommodation would contravene Mapesbury Conservation Area Design Guide.
- As the site falls within a controlled parking zone this would suggest there would be a demand for parking and as such removal of a garage would be of detriment to the local area
- Loss of privacy, daylight and sunlight – contrary to Brent Development Management Policies
- The installation of an electric gate and external air source heat pump would result in noise pollution, detrimental to the local flora and fauna and natural habitats for wildlife.
- The application would set a precedent for similar an undesirable developments contrary to the Article 4 Design Guide

In accordance with the planning Code of Practice, Councillor Colacicco (ward member) addressed the Committee. Councillor Colacicco stated that whilst Mapesbury Area Residents' Association did not object to the application, they would like to see strict conditions imposed to ensure that the applicant did not deviate from the plans submitted.

In responding to the issues raised, the Planning Officer clarified that by using discreet materials, the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character of the area. She added that the structural engineer and building regulations would ensure that the external heat pump would not give rise to undue noise. Furthermore, conditions had been imposed for permeable landscaping and to prevent permitted development including upward development.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and



asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted unanimously to approve the application as recommended.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.  
(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous)

**8. 20/0614 16A & 16B Mapesbury Road, London, NW2 4JB**

PROPOSAL:

Change of use from residential (Use Class C3) to operational diplomatic and consular services (Use Class Sui Generis) for a temporary period of 3 years and associated alterations to car parking, installation of pedestrian gates and new fencing.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee resolve to 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 Committee reports.

And 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.

Mr Damian Manhertz (Development Management Area Team Manager) introduced the report, set out the key issues and answered Members' questions. He added that the proposal was not considered likely to result in an excessive amount of traffic, obstruct the highway or result in unsafe conditions on the highway. It was noted that there is an extant permission that allowed the building to be redeveloped and some of the proposed changes. Furthermore the proposed change of use, involving internal works only was not considered to result in harm to the character and appearance to the conservation area and that the proposed conditions would ensure that the development would make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the Brondesbury Conservation Area.

With no further issues raised and having established that all members had followed the discussions, the Chair thanked all speakers for their contributions and asked members to vote on the recommendation. Members voted unanimously to approve the application as recommended.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended.  
(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous).

## **9. Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 9.27 pm

COUNCILLOR J. DENSELOW  
Chair

Notes:

1. Councillor Hylton left part way during consideration of item 4 and did not take part in the voting on any of the applications.
2. At 8.04, the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes.